

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.
For the present, THE QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;
the times of publication of THE REVIEW are variable under war conditions

MAR 3 1943

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

M. PLATNAUER, M.A., B.Litt., Brasenose College, Oxford

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.R.S. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A. } Representing the Council of the
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A. F. H. SANDRACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.) } Classical Association
Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.
E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.R.S. representing the Oxford Philological Society
With the co-operation of Prof. E. E. RAND, Harvard University, Prof. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland,
and Prof. R. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

RBA

Volume XXXVI

OCTOBER 1942

Numbers 3, 4

CONTENTS

NERO ARTIFEX: THE APOCOCYNTOSIS RECONSIDERED	83
Jocelyn M. C. Toynbee	
THE GROWTH OF THE GREEK 'APOMNIAI. M. I. HENDERSON	94
THEOCRITUS, IDYLL XXIV—STARS AND DOORS. A. S. F. GOW	104
CAMILLUS AND CONCORD. ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO	111
ONOMATOPOEIA AND THE SCEPTICS. L. P. WILKINSON	121
COMMENTARII IN HIPPOCRATES P.OXY. 2176, fragm. 6. P. MAAS	133
ALCAEUS OF MESSENE, PHILIP V, AND ROME. F. W. WALBANK	134

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

HUMPHREY MILFORD: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Price for single numbers, 4s. net (4s. 2d. post free); for double numbers, 8s. net (8s. 4d. post free). Yearly subscription 16s. post free; U.S.A. \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. post free; U.S.A. \$5.32.

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.B., LITT.D.
R. CAPPE, PH.D., LL.D. W. E. D. ROSS, LITT.D.
L. A. POST, M.A. R. E. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Each volume *Pooleys* 8vo, 400-600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is so contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*

New Books Ready, 1943

LATIN

348, 349 CICERO. DE ORATORE, &c. Two vols. Vol. I, DE ORATORE, Books I and II. Translated by C. S. Stansford, E. W. Sutton, and H. Rackham; Vol. II, DE ORATORE, Book III, DE FATO, PARADOXA STOICORUM, PARTITIONES ORATORIAE. Translated by H. Rackham.

352 PLINY. NATURAL HISTORY. Ten volumes. Vol. II, Books III-VII. Translated by H. Rackham.

361 COLUMELLA. DE RE RUSTICA. Three volumes. Vol. I, Books I-IV. Translated by H. B. Ash.

GREEK

360 GREEK LITERARY PAPYRI. Two volumes. Vol. I, PONTA. Selected and translated by D. L. Page.

362 GREEK MATHEMATICAL WORKS. Two volumes. Vol. II, ARISTARCHUS TO PAPPUS OF ALEXANDRIA. Selections translated by I. Thomas.

363 PHILO. Ten volumes. Vol. IX. Translated by F. H. Colson.

Descriptive Prospectus giving particulars of the volumes already published and those in preparation will be sent free on application to the publishers.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

CLASSICAL BOOKS

As of all subjects we hold a very large stock of Classical Books both new and second-hand. Owing to paper restrictions we are not able to issue our usual catalogues but we will gladly answer all enquiries. We are anxious to purchase good Classical Books as well as good books in every field of Literature, Science and Arts



W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD
4 PRITY CURY, CAMBRIDGE

ATTIC RED-FIGURE VASE-PAINTERS

By J. D. BEAZLEY
63s. net

This is a new edition, very greatly enlarged and improved, of a work published in 1925. It gives the complete results of the writer's researches into the authorship of Attic red-figured vases. Some 16,000 pieces are dealt with (as against 10,000 in the previous edition), and it may be said that nearly all Attic red-figured vases are now assigned to their painters



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

TH

THE ancient
tance from
ship of a
can read
moreover
cyntosis.
of any al
has been
cyntosis a
other an
as unlike
subject a
style, she
proof is s
which, ac
ὀνομασας.

But if
wholly un
is aware,
soon after
October,
last mon
Henderso
unanimi
be to syn
fact, ofte
two Sene
the access
to the ne
55 appear
an establi
it entails.
to sugges

¹ For rec
V. M. Scra
notes, *pass*

² Dio 60.

³ *The Sa*
Claudius, 5

⁴ 'De lu
1916, 295-31

⁵ J. Wig
in the Silver

⁶ *The L*
Nero, 51-4.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

OCTOBER 1942

NERO ARTIFEX: THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS RECONSIDERED

THE ancient tradition ascribing to Seneca the *Ludus de morte Claudii* has won acceptance from the vast majority of modern critics.¹ Given the record of Seneca's authorship of a skit of this very type, the *Apocolocyntosis*,² the style and spirit of the piece can readily be recognized as those of the philosopher-poet in his lighter vein. It is, moreover, generally agreed that the *Ludus* is in fact to be identified with the *Apocolocyntosis*. The obvious difficulty involved in this identification, namely the absence of any allusion to the term 'apocolocyntosis' in the *Ludus* as it has come down to us, has been faced and answered by A. P. Ball.³ J. J. Hartman's view that the *Apocolocyntosis* and *Ludus* were two separate works, both by Seneca, the one signed and the other anonymous,⁴ has not on the whole commended itself to scholars. Indeed it is as unlikely that Seneca should have produced two such similar works on the same subject as that Seneca and an anonymous contemporary, a close imitator of Senecan style, should both have handled the same theme on similar lines. While positive proof is still lacking, the overwhelming probability is that our *Ludus* is the σύγγραμμα which, according to Dio, Seneca composed, ἀποκολοκύντῳ αὐτὸ ὡς περ τινὰ ἀθανάτιον ὀνομάσας.

But if the traditional equation of the *Ludus* with the *Apocolocyntosis* has not gone wholly unchallenged, the date of the satire has never yet, so far as the present writer is aware, become a matter of dispute. 'It rings as if it must have been written very soon after the official deification which it burlesques, i.e. soon after the middle of October, A.D. 54'⁵; and this has been the verdict of all critics, who date the piece to the last months of 54 or to the early part of 55, whether they accept or reject B. W. Henderson's categorical ascription of it to the Saturnalia of 54.⁶ The reason for this unanimity is not far to seek. Obviously the reader's immediate reaction will always be to synchronize the satire and the event which it satirizes; quite apart from the fact, often noted, of a certain community of ideas between the *Apocolocyntosis* and two Senecan works which belong indubitably to the early days of Nero's principate, the accession speech delivered by Nero in the Senate⁷ and the *De Clementia* addressed to the new Emperor by his tutor. Indeed, the dating of the piece to late 54 or early 55 appears, on the face of it, to be so obvious that scholars have come to regard it as an established fact, without, it would seem, being fully aware of the difficulties which it entails. The object of this paper is to examine some of the problems involved and to suggest, tentatively, a possible alternative to the accepted view. It does not claim

¹ For recent literature see CAH x. 974, and V. M. Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius*, c. i, notes, *passim*.

² Dio 60. 35.

³ *The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Claudius*, 52.

⁴ 'De ludo de morte Claudii' (*Mnemosyne*, 1916, 295-314).

⁵ J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*, 245.

⁶ *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, 51-4, 458; *Five Roman Emperors*, 28-9.

Such dogmatism is, however, hardly justified by the two references to the Saturnalia which the *Apocolocyntosis* contains and on which, presumably, Henderson's assertion is based: c. 8, 'si mehercules a Saturno petisset hoc beneficium, cuius mensem toto anno celebravit (Saturnali-cius) princeps, non tulisset illud'; c. 12, 'dicebam vobis: non semper Saturnalia erunt'. Cf. R. Waltz, *Vie de Sénèque*, 196 ff.

⁷ Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 4. Cf. Scramuzza, *op. cit.* 228, n. 28, for a comparison between the *Apocolocyntosis* and Nero's speech.

to offer more than a suggestion; for it is impossible, on the evidence, to *prove* the case proposed.

Assuming that Seneca composed and published the *Apocolocyntosis* in 54 or 55, what was his motive? Was it personal spite, the rankling memory of his banishment, which spurred him on to snatch the earliest opportunity of paying off old scores?¹ It is hardly conceivable that a responsible philosopher, tutor to the fledgeling Emperor and the leading statesman of his day, should have allowed petty resentment to jeopardize, first the prestige of the Senate, which had just consecrated Claudius, and of imperial *consecratio* in general, secondly, the goodwill of Agrippina, just appointed priestess of Claudius² and already, perhaps, inaugurating his temple on the Caelian,³ and thirdly, the confidence of his imperial pupil, who, at Seneca's dictation, had just delivered the dead Emperor's *laudatio*,⁴ whose whole claim to the throne was based on his position as Claudius' adopted heir and to whom it was, at this juncture, very convenient to be 'Divi filius'.⁵ Was Seneca stirred to this attack by disgust at the whole business of apotheosis? Did this satire veil a solemn warning to Nero against the seductions of divine honours?⁶ It is not easy to believe in the conscientious objections to ruler-worship (as such) of the author of the *Consolatio ad Polybium*, which, though indubitably composed by Seneca with the ulterior motive of securing his recall, is not to be interpreted as merely abject flattery, but rather as a picture of the perfect ruler, 'at least in part, a discussion of the new imperial ideology which was being developed by the advanced thought of the Stoic school'.⁷ In this treatise on the ideal Emperor, 'the hard-worked and hard-working man... the "servus servorum Romae"'—an ideal, indeed, which Claudius, as revealed by the results of modern research, implemented to no inconsiderable degree—the Caesar is presented to Polybius as *numen tuum*;⁸ we have references to his *fulgor*,¹⁰ to his future deification,¹¹ to his *divinae manus*,¹² *divina auctoritas*,¹³ and *divina vestigia*;¹⁴ he is 'sidus hoc, quod praecipitato in profundum et demerso in tenebras orbi refulsit'.¹⁵ Again, in the *De Clementia* Nero is the gods' vicegerent—'electusque sum qui in terris deorum vice fungerer';¹⁶ he is the 'clarum et beneficum sidus' to which men fly;¹⁷ he, no less than the sun, is the cynosure of every eye—'tibi non magis quam soli latere contingit. multa contra te lux est';¹⁸ and the cult of Divus Augustus is described as a spontaneous growth—'deum esse non tanquam iussi credimus'.¹⁹ If these phrases do not imply direct deification of the living ruler, they certainly tend at least to blur the frontier between the human and divine. But the most conclusive argument against the *Apocolocyntosis* as an anti-Emperor-worship manifesto is the fact that in this work itself the living Nero is compared directly with a god.²⁰

¹ Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 8, 'infensus Claudio dolore iniuriae credebatur'.

² Ibid. xiii. 2, 'flamini Claudiale'.

³ Suetonius, *Vesp.* 9, 'Divi Claudii [templum] in Caelio monte coeptum quidem ab Agrippina'.

⁴ Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 3. Tacitus does not say that Nero made fun of Claudius in the *laudatio*, as Scramuzza states (op. cit. 276, n. 5), but that reference to Claudius' *providentia* and *sapientia*, so quaintly contrasted in people's minds with his ridiculous physique and odd temperament, moved the Senate to laughter. There is also no evidence that Nero's insulting behaviour to Claudius' memory, described by Suetonius (*Nero*, 33), must be dated immediately after the latter's death.

⁵ Cf. M. P. Charlesworth, *JRS* 1937, 57 ff.

⁶ Cf. R. Waltz, op. cit. 196 ff.: 'Surtout

l'*Apokolokyntose* constituait une attaque énergique contre la plus monarchique des coutumes du principat, je veux dire, cette *consecratio*, cette transformation du prince en dieu. . . . Il était impossible enfin de mettre Néron plus fortement en garde contre les séductions de la grandeur et les folies de l'omnipotence.'

⁷ Scramuzza, op. cit. 7; cf. J. J. Hartman, op. cit.

⁸ J. W. Mackail, *The Lesson of Imperial Rome*, pp. 24, 25.

⁹ *Ad Polyb.* viii. 1.

¹⁰ Ibid. xii. 3.

¹¹ Ibid. xii. 5; xvi. 4.

¹² Ibid. xiii. 2.

¹³ Ibid. xiv. 2.

¹⁴ Ibid. xvii. 1.

¹⁵ Ibid. xviii. 1.

¹⁶ *De Clem.* i. i. 2.

¹⁷ Ibid. i. viii. 4.

¹⁸ Ibid. i. x. 3.

¹⁹ Ibid. i. x. 3.

²⁰ *Apocol.* 4. *Vide infra*, p. 86.

wrote th
to squas
on the o
new regi
nach Cla
officially
question
major sc
Agrippin
to exerci
a god an
Claudius'
We can h
made Se
juncture,
evidence
from any
pendent
tamquam
have felt
all his ob
offered a
respects,

All the
was writt
attack up
indeed, so
divine hor
political m
and unsee
when she
Nero's sid

Such, t
work of th

¹ A. Kurf
² Ball, op
colocyntosis C
committed u
the freedmen
had had a h
is no proof th
of close colla
only natural
dwelling on
return to po
chargeable to
death of the
mitted before

³ Kleine S
Beurlier, *Le C*

⁴ Op. cit. g

⁵ Tacitus,

Similar problems present themselves when we turn to the theory that Seneca wrote the *Apocolocyntosis* in collaboration with Agrippina, on the one hand, in order to squash the murder rumour and popularize the official version of Claudius' end,¹ on the other, to discredit Claudius' reign and intimate that with the beginning of the new regime better times were at hand.² Bücheler writes of 'die Doppelrolle, welche nach Claudius Tod der Hof spielte':³ in other words, the court consecrated Claudius officially while deconsecrating him unofficially. Here again we are faced with the question of the Senate's prestige. Seneca might conceivably have sacrificed this to major scruples about the imperial cult, but not, surely, to a double game played for Agrippina's sake. What influence for good, moreover, could the Stoic tutor have hoped to exercise over his pupil, were he to teach him, now to honour his adoptive father as a god and to assume a respectful attitude towards the Senate, now to mock at Claudius' godhead and, by implication, at the Senate which had conferred it on him? We can hardly agree with Scramuzza⁴ that a denunciation of Claudius would have made Seneca popular with the conservative senators, when it involved, at that juncture, a denunciation of their own recent decree of consecration. There is no evidence that the Senate consecrated Claudius under pressure, from Agrippina or from anyone else. The Senate, indeed, immediately proceeded to take a very independent line—'multa arbitrio senatus constituta sunt . . . adversante Agrippina, tamquam acta Claudii subverterentur'.⁵ Whatever the die-hard traditionalists may have felt at the time, the Senate officially and as a body recognized that Claudius, for all his obvious defects, deserved deification for his positive achievements and that he offered a contrast, at any rate, to his execrable predecessor, Gaius, and even, in some respects, to the undeified Tiberius.

All the same objections can be urged against the theory that the *Apocolocyntosis* was written, not in collaboration with Agrippina, but, conversely, as a masterly attack upon her as the author of Claudius' consecration.⁶ Seneca and Burrus did, indeed, soon find themselves in conflict with Agrippina, but not over any matter of divine honours paid by her to Claudius. The specific points at issue were, first, the political murders perpetrated at her instigation,⁷ and, secondly, her presumptuous and unseemly conduct on the occasion of the Armenian envoys' visit to Rome, when she was preparing to mount the imperial platform and take her seat at Nero's side.⁸

Such, then, are some of the general difficulties attending the ascription of a Senecan work of the content and spirit of the *Apocolocyntosis* to 54-5. A further difficulty

¹ A. Kurfess, *Phil. Woch.* 1924, 1308-9.

² Ball, *op. cit.* 19. The fact that in the *Apocolocyntosis* Claudius is only charged with crimes committed under the influence of Messallina and the freedmen, while those in which Agrippina had had a hand are largely ignored (*ibid.* 39), is no proof that the piece was written in a spirit of close collaboration with that lady. It was only natural that Seneca should refrain from dwelling on crimes perpetrated after his own return to power in 49. The one notable crime chargeable to Agrippina which he mentions, the death of the innocent Silanus (c. 8), was committed before his recall (*vide infra*, p. 93).

³ *Kleine Schriften*, i (1915), 442. Cf. E. Beurlier, *Le Culte impérial*, 33.

⁴ *Op. cit.* 9.

⁵ Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 5 (cf. Scramuzza, *op. cit.*

127). Incidentally neither of the two acts of the Senate to which Agrippina took exception can be construed as a direct attack on Claudius' memory. The enactment about barristers' fees, etc., was an extension, not a reversal, of Claudius' decree (Tacitus, *Ann.* xi. 7), while Claudius' measure directing that gladiatorial shows should be given by quaestors designate (*ibid.* xi. 22) may have been repealed as proving burdensome to individuals, not as prejudicial to the Senate as such.

⁶ R. Waltz, *op. cit.* 196 ff.; T. Birt, *Neue Jahrb. f. d. klass. Alter.* (1911), 99; K. Münscher, *Philologus*, Suppl. xvi. i (1922); O. Viedebant, *Rh. Mus.* (1926), 142.

⁷ Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 2, 'certamen utrique unum erat contra ferociam Agrippinae'.

⁸ Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 5; Dio, 61. 3.

arises directly from a particular passage in the text, the poem in c. 4 which describes how the Fates spin out the thread of Nero's Golden Age:

mutatur vilis pretioso lana metallo,
aurea formoso descendunt saecula filo,

while Apollo Citharoedus stands by and assists their task with song:

Phoebus adest cantuque iuvat gaudetque futuris,
et laetus nunc plectra movet, nunc pensa ministrat.

Every new reign was, in a sense, regarded as inaugurating a new Golden Age, and taken by itself the Golden Age metaphor might fit the beginning of Nero's principate: the passage is, indeed, normally interpreted as a poetic counterpart of the young Emperor's accession speech. But what is Apollo doing in this context? Momigliano¹ and O. Weinreich² see in him the Augustan Apollo, personifying the new Emperor's Augustan programme.³ 'The contrast [i.e. between the new rule and that of Claudius]', writes Momigliano, 'finds its most forcible expression in the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca, where the divine Augustus is one of the most formidable accusers of Claudius,⁴ and where Apollo, the Augustan deity, predicts a return to justice and liberality.' Augustus' indictment of Claudius is, indeed, based specifically on the number of persons he has done to death, but in the Apollo-poem the only possible reference to a reversal of Claudian policy is contained in the half-line *legumque silentia rumpet*.⁵ All the emphasis is on Apollo as musician and on Nero as the god's 'double', his compeer in physical beauty and musical endowment, comparable to Lucifer, to Hesperus, and to Sol driving in his chariot, a new Apollo Citharoedus reigning in Rome:

Phoebus ait: 'vincat mortalis tempora vitae
ille, mihi similis vultu similisque decore
nec cantu nec voce minor . . .

. . .
qualis discutiens fugientia Lucifer astra
aut qualis surgit redeuntibus Hesperus astris,
qualis cum primum tenebris Aurora solutis
induxit rubicunda diem, Sol aspicit orbem
lucidus et primos a carcere concitat axes:
talis Caesar adest, talem iam Roma Neronem
aspiciet. flagrat nitidus fulgore remisso
vultus et adfuso cervix formosa capillo.'

Is it really conceivable that Seneca would have thought it suitable to write of the young Emperor in such terms as early as 54-5? In order to answer this question we must examine the situation of Nero *qua artifex* (τεχνίτης, 'artiste') during the early years of the principate and the attitude of Seneca and Burrus towards the embarrassing tastes of their imperial pupil.

Tacitus and Dio have nothing to tell us of musical or charioteering activities on Nero's part at the time of his accession to the throne in 54, at the age of seventeen. But according to Suetonius these topics were well to the fore in his mind. 'As soon as he became Emperor', writes Suetonius,⁶ 'he sent for Terpnus, the greatest master

¹ CAH x. 703-4.

² Senecas *Apocolocyntosis*, 38 ff.

³ Suetonius, *Nero*, 10, 'ex Augusti praescripto imperatorum se professus'.

⁴ Cf. Momigliano, *Claudius: the Emperor and his Achievement*, p. 77.

⁵ Cf. *De Clem.* 1. iv, 'sic me custodio, tamquam legibus, quas ex situ ac tenebris in lucem evocavi, rationem redditurus sim'.

⁶ *Nero*, 20. I quote from the translation in the Loeb edition.

of the
sive day
none of
to prese
his voic
and the
meanin
he used
country
openly.
frequent
Nero ap
or chari
formanc
or in th
Accessio
showed
advisers
keeping
drawing
a rival.
early sta
and Nero
belief th
his yout
cessions
evidence
court po
too shar
lulling th
such wer
Einsidlen
reign of
the perio
Suetoniu
occasion
Bucolics
of the w

¹ Nero,

² Nero's
whether in
subsequent
place at la
coincided
stage, first
(in 64, 65,

³ CAH x

⁴ Ann. x

⁵ Cf. the
xiii. 2 (54)
Seneca and
phrases ce
artistic, an

of the lyre in those days, and after listening to him sing after dinner for many successive days until late at night, he little by little began to practise himself, neglecting none of the exercises which artists (*artifices*) of that kind are in the habit of following, to preserve or strengthen their voices. . . . Finally, encouraged by his progress, although his voice was weak and husky, he began to long to appear on the stage and every now and then in the presence of his intimate friends he would quote a Greek proverb meaning "Hidden music counts for nothing". Again: "At the beginning of his reign he used to play every day with ivory chariots on a board, and he came from the country to all the games, even the most insignificant, at first secretly, and then openly. . . . He soon longed to drive a chariot himself and even to show himself frequently in public."² We observe that, as far as the ancient writers are concerned, Nero appears in the opening years of his reign as the *potential* artist, whether in singing or charioteering, privately studying and training himself with possible future performances in view, but not as the *actual* artist, appearing in person on the boards or in the circus. The following words of Momigliano in his section entitled 'The Accession of Nero'³ are, therefore, somewhat misleading: 'Though Nero's character showed a precocious development in cruelty, sensuality and artistic enthusiasm, his advisers, especially Seneca, actually encouraged these tendencies in the hope of keeping him bound to them by detaching him from his mother, and possibly too of drawing his attention away from political problems so that they could rule without a rival.' But there is no evidence that Seneca and Burrus encouraged Nero at this early stage in his reign in his artistic enthusiasms. Tacitus⁴ says that in 55 Seneca and Nero's *seniores amici* did not oppose his passion for the freedwoman Acte, in the belief that the young Emperor would find there a comparatively harmless outlet for his youthful passions (*primae adolescentis cupidines*).⁵ Nothing is said about concessions in the matters of acting, singing, or charioteering. Nor, again, is there any evidence that Nero had at this early stage already become the centre of a circle of court poets. Yet Momigliano, in the same section on Nero's accession, writes: 'Poets too shared in propaganda for the programme [i.e. Nero's accession programme], lulling themselves with the fancy of a new age of gold and helping to spread the fancy: such were Calpurnius Siculus in his *Bucolics*, the anonymous author of the *Carmina Einsidlensia*, and Lucan in the first book of the *Pharsalia*. All of them depicted the reign of Nero as initiating a new era of happiness.'⁶ But does this literature belong to the period of Nero's accession? Lucan's first book was, we know, published in 60, for Suetonius in his *Life* of the poet tells us that he gave a recital of the epic on the occasion of Nero's Quinquennial Games held in that year.⁷ Calpurnius Siculus' *Bucolics* were probably all later at least than 57, for in *Bucolic* vii there is a description of the wooden amphitheatre erected in that year by Nero in the Campus Martius.⁸

¹ Nero, 22.

² Nero's actual appearances as a charioteer, whether in private or public, described in the subsequent part of this sentence, doubtless took place at later points in his reign and probably coincided with his actual appearances on the stage, first in private (in 59) and later in public (in 64, 65, etc.).

³ CAH x. 710.

⁴ Ann. xiii. 12, 13.

⁵ Cf. the *voluptates concessae* of Tacitus, Ann. xiii. 2 (54) and τὸν δὲ δὴ Νέρωνα τρυφᾶν εἶπον (sc. Seneca and Burrus) of Dio, 61. 4. 2 (54). These phrases certainly suggest sensual, rather than artistic, amusements. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. xiv. 21,

where *voluptates concessae* (reasonable self-indulgence or frivolity) are distinguished from *studia honesta* (artistic performances) and appear to be contrasted with the *turpes amores* and *studia externa* of the previous chapter, just as the *laetitia* (including both *studia* and *voluptates*) of c. 21 is contrasted with the *lascivia* (including both *studia* and *amores*) of c. 20.

⁶ CAH x. 704.

⁷ 'Prima ingenii experimenta in "Neronis laudibus" dedit quinquennali certamine, dein "Civile Bellum" . . . recitavit.'

⁸ Tacitus, Ann. xiii. 31; Suetonius, Nero, 12.

Again, Momigliano assigns¹ to the early years of the principate a number of Greek epigrams dedicated by one Lucilius to Nero as patron of young poets.² But there is no reason why these epigrams should not also date from c. 60. Nero is certainly described as young; but in 60 he was still only twenty-three years old. In one poem the singer Hegelochos is mocked at for his singing of the Nauplios song on the *cithara* in Greece. Now Suetonius tells us³ that Nero himself sang the Nauplios song during his Greek tour; and it is argued⁴ that, as Lucilius could hardly have written this epigram and dedicated it to Nero *after* the latter's own performance, it must therefore date from the early years of the reign. But since the tour did not take place until 66, the poem could easily have been written c. 60. In another epigram Lucilius mocks at a bad dancer for the way in which he performed the parts of Niobe, Kapaneus, and Kanake. Suetonius mentions⁵ the Niobe and Kanake as being in Nero's own repertory; and the poem has been dated to the early years of the reign on the ground that it could not have been written *after* Nero had appeared in these parts, as it might have been interpreted as an unflattering allusion to the Emperor. But Suetonius connects these imperial performances with the second celebration of the Quinquennial Games in 65, so that the poem might still have been composed as late as 60. Moreover, is it not possible that Nero chose these very parts—the Niobe and Kanake in 65 and the Nauplios in 66—just to show how he could surpass the bad performers mentioned in Lucilius' epigrams of five or six years before?

In 56 Nero is described by Tacitus⁶ as fostering the passions of the theatre. 'Nero turned also the disorders of the theatre caused by the factions of rival actors into regular battles, giving prizes for them as well as impunity, and himself looking on, sometimes secretly, sometimes openly; until at last the fights among the populace and the fears of more serious trouble left him no remedy but to expel the actors from Italy and replace the guard of soldiers within the theatre.' Here once more Nero appears as spectator of, not as partaker in, theatrical performances. We can imagine that the expulsion of the actors was due to pressure exerted by Seneca and Burrus.

It is clear that by 58 Seneca was beginning to feel the difficulties of his equivocal position. According to Dio,⁷ certain persons began to attack the philosopher for his unphilosophic conduct in (a) having committed adultery with Julia, daughter of Germanicus, and with Agrippina, (b) acting as *τυραννοδιδάσκαλος* and frequenting the Palace, while condemning tyranny and running down those who consorted with tyrants, (c) abusing flatterers, while having himself composed the *Ad Polybium*: after which, we are told, Seneca suppressed that work,⁸ (d) amassing wealth. According to Tacitus,⁹ Suillius, a member of Claudius' 'old gang', accused Seneca (a) of hostility to the friends of Claudius, under whom he had justly suffered exile, (b) of indulging in profitless pursuits (*studia inertia*) and consorting with ignorant youths (*iuvenum imperitiae suetum*), (c) of jealousy of honest orators, (d) of adultery with Julia, (e) of amassing wealth. In this context the allusion to enmity to the friends of Claudius is certainly more suggestive of the suppression of the *Ad Polybium*, with its eulogy of the Emperor, than of the publication four years before, according to the received dating, of the *Apocolocyntosis*.¹⁰ It would seem from these passages that Seneca was now being gradually dissociated from his Claudian connexion as author of Nero's *laudatio* and driven into acquiescence in Nero's growing independence as regards the satisfaction of his tastes. Obviously at this stage Nero had less to gain

¹ CAH x. 710, n. 1.

² Anth. Pal. ix. 572; xi. 132, 185, 254.

³ Nero, 39.

⁴ C. Cichorius, 'Chronologisches zu den Gedichten des Lucilius' (*Römische Studien* (1922), 372-4).

⁵ Nero, 21.

⁶ Ann. xiii. 25. I quote from G. G. Ramsay's translation (1909).

⁷ 61. 10.

⁸ *ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπ' αἰσχύνῃς ἀπῆλειψε.*

⁹ Ann. xiii. 42.

¹⁰ Scramuzza, op. cit., 10 and 228, n. 29.

from an
father t
to Nero

But
passion
Tacitus
race, an
racing,
been ex
Apollo;
only in
and Sem
his insi
was to
and app
of the s
hoped;
ing oth
poverty
himself
kinds of
anyone
upon th
beside h
Burrus a
of Roma
would k
tions up
and still
Dio,³ 'N
own nar
(σκενή,
your kin
"Attis"
that the
and indi
once. Be
prompti
and lead
five thou
prominer
all the sh
them ex
By thys
tant poin
Seneca an
imperial
assumed
Apollo C

¹ Ann.

² Nero,

from an assertion of his role as *Divi Claudii filius* than from the turning of his adoptive father to account as his own foil. Claudius the buffoon would make a telling contrast to Nero *artifex*.

But it was not until 59 that we have quite definite evidence that Nero's passion for the arts was beginning to prove too much for his mentors. 'Nero', writes Tacitus¹ apropos of that year, 'had long entertained a desire to drive in a chariot race, and a no less disreputable fancy to sing to the lyre upon the stage. Chariot-racing, he would say, had been an ancient diversion for kings and generals; it had been extolled by poets, and practised in honour of the gods. Song was sacred to Apollo; and that famous god of prophecy was represented in a musician's dress, not only in Greek cities, but in Roman temples also. There was now no holding him back; and Seneca and Burrus thought it best to give way on one of the two points, to prevent his insisting upon both. A space was enclosed in the Vatican Valley, in which he was to drive a chariot before a select company. But soon the public were invited, and applauded lustily; for the mob delights in pleasures, and rejoices to see its rulers of the same mind. But this publicity of shame brought with it no satiety, as was hoped; it only fanned the flame; and thinking to lessen his own disgrace by besmirching others, Nero brought upon the stage men sprung from noble families whose poverty left them open to be bought. . . . Not wishing, however, as yet to disgrace himself upon a public stage, Nero instituted games called "Juvenalia", for which all kinds of persons gave in their names. Neither birth, nor age, nor official rank hindered anyone from acting in Greek or Latin plays. . . . Last of all, Nero presented himself upon the stage; attuning his lyre with great care, and giving the note to the musicians beside him. A cohort of soldiers, with Centurions and Tribunes, was in attendance; Burrus also was there, distressed, but yet applauding. It was then first that a body of Roman Knights was formed under the name of "Augustiani". These men . . . would keep up a din of applause for whole days and nights, bestowing divine appellations upon Nero's voice and person.' The 'Juvenalia' are also described by Suetonius,² and still more vividly by Dio. 'As a fitting climax to these performances', writes Dio,³ 'Nero himself made his appearance in the theatre, being announced under his own name by Gallio. So there stood this Caesar on the stage wearing the garb (σκενὴ, "rig-out") of a lyre-player. This Emperor uttered the words: "My lords, of your kindness give me ear", and this Augustus sang to the lyre some piece called "Attis" or "The Bacchantes", while many soldiers stood by and all the people that the seats would hold sat watching. Yet he had, according to report, but a slight and indistinct voice, so that he moved his whole audience to laughter and tears at once. Beside him stood Burrus and Seneca, like teachers (καθάπερ τινὲς διδάσκαλοι), prompting him; and they would wave their arms and togas at every utterance of his and lead others to do the same. Indeed, Nero had got ready a special corps of about five thousand soldiers, called Augustans; . . . and all the rest, . . . and especially the prominent men, assembled with alacrity, grieved though they were, and joined in all the shouts of the Augustans, as if they were delighted. And one might have heard them exclaiming: "Glorious Caesar! Our Apollo, our Augustus, another Pythian! By thyself we swear, O Caesar, none surpasses thee." In these passages the important points to note are that Nero has now appeared upon the private stage; that Seneca and Burrus, having decided to accept the inevitable, are determined that their imperial pupil shall sing and act respectably, if sing and act he must, and have assumed the role of 'coaches'; and that Nero has put himself under the patronage of Apollo Citharoedus, appears on the stage in Apollo's dress and person and receives

¹ *Ann.* xiv. 14, 15.

² *Nero*, 11, 12.

³ 61. 19-21. I quote from the translation in the Loeb edition.

divine appellations, as though identified with the god, being addressed by the Augustans as 'Our Apollo, another Pythian'. The Apollo aspect of the affair seems to be something quite new in 59: we have no trace of it in the early years of Nero's reign.¹

It is in 59, too, that Nero first appears as the centre of a circle of court poets. 'Not satisfied, however,' says Tacitus,² 'with the fame of his theatrical accomplishments, Nero affected a taste for poetry also, gathering round him persons with some as yet undistinguished poetic faculty. These men would sit down with him after dinner, and string together verses which they had either brought with them, or concocted on the spot; or they would fill up the gaps in Nero's own slipshod productions, as appears from the character of the lines themselves, which have neither the freshness nor the unity of original compositions.'

The next year, in 60, so Tacitus tells us,³ Nero instituted at Rome a quinquennial show (*quinquennale ludicrum*) after the model of the Greek Games. Pantomimic actors appeared on the stage, and during the celebration Greek dress was worn. Suetonius says⁴ that the show was called the *Neronia* and consisted of contests in music, gymnastics, and riding. Nero was awarded the prize for lyre-playing and had it laid at the feet of a statue of Augustus—another imperial devotee of Apollo, be it noted. Dio says⁵ that Nero got the prize for lyre-playing without actually competing himself and that he appeared in the gymnasium (which here must mean a music-school) in the lyre-player's garb (*σολῆς*).⁶

Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Book i, with its allusions in the prologue to the Golden Age of peace⁷ and poetry⁸ which Nero brings, and its identification of Nero with Phoebus Apollo,⁹ was, as we have seen,¹⁰ actually published at the *Neronia* of 60. It is just to the 59-60 context—the context of Nero's appearance on the private stage as a lyre-player, patronized by, and, indeed, identified with, Apollo Citharoedus, of his emergence as patron and member of a poets' circle, and of his inauguration at the *Neronia* of a new *quinquennium*, a new era or new Golden Age—and not to the context of the opening years of the principate, that the *Carmina Einsidlensia*, the *Bucolics* of Calpurnius Siculus, and the epigrams of Lucilius, with their Golden Age descriptions and atmosphere¹¹ and their references to Nero as Apollo and poets' patron,¹² all belong. And it is into this context again that the Apollo-poem of *Apocolocyntosis* 4¹³ exactly fits. May it not then have been for the *Neronia* of 60 that Seneca wrote his skit,

¹ Both on the Roman and on the Alexandrian coinage Nero is not shown with Apollo's rayed crown until 64 (Mattingly and Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, i. 139; J. Vogt, *Alexandrinische Münzen*, 27).

² *Ann.* xiv. 16.

³ *Ann.* xiv. 20, 21.

⁴ *Nero*, 12.

⁵ 61. 21.

⁶ Cf. the later Nero-Apollo-Citharoedus bronze coin types of 64-8 (Mattingly, *Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, i, pp. clxxxi f., 245 ff., 249 ff., 274; pls. 44, Nos. 7-10, 12; 45, No. 2; 47, No. 7; 48, No. 6) and Suetonius, *Nero*, 25 (apropos of Nero's return from his Greek tour in 68): 'item statuas suas citharoedico habitu [posuit], qua nota etiam nummum percussit'; cf. also the Augustan coin types of the Actian Apollo Citharoedus (Mattingly, op. cit., pls. 11, Nos. 7, 8, 9; 12, Nos. 1, 3-8).

⁷ 'Pax missa per orbem | ferrea belligeri com-pescat limina Iani' (ll. 61-2). Corbulo's subjugation of Armenia was completed by the summer of 60 and peace seemed to have come in the East.

⁸ 'Tu satis ad vires Romana in carmina dandas' (l. 66).

⁹ 'Seu te flammigeros Phoebi consendere currus telluremque nihil mutato sole timentem igne vago lustrare iuvet' (ll. 48-50).

¹⁰ *Vide supra*, p. 87.

¹¹ e.g. *Carmina Einsidlensia*, ii. 21 ff.; Calpurnius Siculus, *Bucolics*, i. 42 ff.; iv. 107 ff.

¹² e.g. *Carmina Einsidlensia*, i. 36 ('hic vester Apollo est'); ii. 38 ('tuus iam regnat Apollo'); Calpurnius Siculus, *Bucolics*, i. 94; iv. *passim*; vii. 83 ('ac nisi me visus decepit, in uno | et Martis vultus et Apollinis esse probatur'); *Anth. Pal.* ix. 572; xi. 132, 185, 254.

¹³ *Vide supra*, p. 86.

accepting forming, y informatio describes' year, and suggests it were, th were indee of the pie saeculi fel

But w Claudius a cyntosis is the Senato impugn th be less inv a few mon of his suc his deified upon the jest⁴ and On the Ro that date cally infor Vespasian cancel Cla as late as Italy in 60 onwards 1 and in 60, a new Gol

¹ *Ann.* x.

² *Nero*, 3.

³ *Paneg.*

sed ut irrid

⁴ Dio, 60

supra, p. 89

supporter v

sion of his

his *bon mot*

(59 or 60).

consecration

that it was

tion, as Bal

⁵ Dio, 60

⁶ Matting

pl. 38, No.

⁷ *Claudius*

principum

tus; quem

tumque rec

'fecit... to

monte coep

Nerone prop

accepting the equation of his imperial pupil with Apollo Citharoedus and thus conforming, *faute de mieux*, with the prevailing fashion of the day? We have no direct information as to the month and day on which the *Neronia* were held. But Tacitus describes¹ their second celebration in 65 among the events of the latter part of that year, and 13 October, the anniversary of Nero's accession, is the date which naturally suggests itself. The inauguration of the new *quinquennium* at the *Neronia* was, as it were, the beginning of a new reign, a new accession; and if the *Apocolocyntosis* were indeed written for 13 October 60, this would give new point to the opening words of the piece: 'quid actum sit in caelo ante diem iii idus Octobris anno novo, initio saeculi felicissimi, volo memoriae tradere.'

But why, it may be asked, should Seneca rake up the death and consecration of Claudius as the subject for a comic piece penned in 60? The theme of the *Apocolocyntosis* is, of course, that Divus Claudius had never really become a god at all, that the Senate's decree of consecration had never, after all, been ratified in heaven. To impugn the validity of a senatorial decree passed six years earlier would obviously be less invidious and delicate a business than to do so in the case of one passed only a few months, or weeks, before. Meanwhile, how did Divus Claudius fare at the hands of his successor and adopted son? There is no evidence that Nero's open mockery of his deified predecessor, as described by Suetonius² and Pliny,³ followed immediately upon the consecration, or (what is on the face of it highly improbable) that Gallio's jest⁴ and the joke about the mushrooms as food of the gods⁵ were made in 54 or 55. On the Roman imperial coinage Nero appears as DIVI F till as late as 56.⁶ But after that date DIVI F disappears from coins struck in the capital; and Suetonius categorically informs us that Nero first neglected and then abolished Claudius' cult and that Vespasian restored it.⁷ It is certain that Nero did not actually 'abolish' or officially cancel Claudius' godhead. He appears as DIVI CL F on coins of Cappadocia issued as late as 64,⁸ in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* of 58-9 and 69,⁹ and in inscriptions in Italy in 66,¹⁰ in Sardinia in 67-8,¹¹ and in Egypt in 68.¹² But it is clear that from 56 onwards Nero was growing progressively less interested in his role as *Divi filius*; and in 60, when Agrippina was dead and the institution of the *Neronia*, inaugurating a new Golden Age¹³ and a new beginning, offered a suitable occasion for a break with

¹ *Ann.* xvi. 2 and 4.

² *Nero*, 33. *Vide supra*, p. 84, n. 4.

³ *Paneg.* 11, 'dicavit caelo . . . Claudium Nero, sed ut irrideret'.

⁴ Dio, 60. 35. Gallio, as we have seen (*vide supra*, p. 89), appeared in 59 as Nero's friend and supporter when he announced him on the occasion of his first performance on the stage, and his *bon mot* may have been made about this time (59 or 60). Dio only says that the fact of the consecration caused the joke (*ἔσθ' ἐν τῷ . . .*), not that it was made on the occasion of the consecration, as Ball says (op. cit. 48).

⁵ Dio, 60. 35; Suetonius, *Nero*, 33.

⁶ Mattingly, op. cit. i, pp. clxxii. 202, No. 11, pl. 38, No. 6.

⁷ *Claudius*, 45, 'funeratusque est sollempni principum pompa et in numerum deorum relatus; quem honorem a Nerone destitutum abolitumque recepit mox per Vespasianum'; *Vesp.* 9, 'fecit . . . templum . . . Divique Claudii in Caelio monte coeptum quidem ab Agrippina, sed a Nerone prope funditus destructum.' Cf. Martial,

Spect. 2; Frontinus, *De aquis*, i. 20. For the use of the title 'Divus Claudius' early in Vespasian's reign see *Octavia Praetexta*, ll. 534, 586, 789. For an explanation of the reference to Claudius without the title 'Divus' in the *Lex de Imperio Vespasiani* see M. P. Charlesworth, *JRS* (1937), 58. The birthday of Divus Claudius was still honoured as a festival in the third century in the *Feriale Duranum* (*Yale Classical Studies*, vii).

⁸ Mattingly, op. cit., pp. clxxiv, 282, 283, pl. 40, Nos. 20-2.

⁹ *ILS* 229, 241.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 233.

¹¹ *CIL* x. 8014.

¹² *OGIS* 669. Beurlier (op. cit. 33) takes Suetonius' 'abolitum' literally: 'Néron fit annuler le décret du Sénat.'

¹³ For the use of Golden Age phraseology in connexion with the second celebration of the *Neronia* see Tacitus, *Ann.* xvi. 2, 'ac forte quinquennale ludicrum secundo lustro celebrabatur, ab oratoribusque praecipua materia in laudem principis adsumpta est. non enim solitas

the past, Nero may well have decided that imperial circles at least should abandon the practice of the cult of Divus Claudius. We can imagine that it was for such an occasion that Seneca, whose interest in Claudius' *consecratio* had doubtless been partly motivated by considerations of state and who in 59-60 had given up the unequal struggle with his imperial pupil's will, produced the *Apocolocyntosis* as a playful *apologia* for the court's impiety. As for the counts against Claudius which led to his summary dismissal from heaven, the insistence upon his bodily and psychological defects may well have been intended to point the contrast with the Apollo-like young Nero on the stage; while the other charges—the statistics of political murders, the favours shown to freedmen, his love of litigation, the alleged miscarriages of justice, and the extension of Roman citizenship to provincials—were a burlesquing and twisting in *deteriora* of just those sides of Claudius' activity which most rankled in the uncomprehending 'inner' circles of traditionalism.¹ To concentrate attention on such charges against his predecessor would be an effective means of 'getting away with' the notion that Nero's new *quinquennium* was heralding an age of gold. It had now been revealed what the gods really thought of Claudius, what actually happened when he died; while Apollo's prophecy for Nero had indeed come true.

In composing the *Apocolocyntosis* Seneca had reached, if he had not overstepped, the uttermost limits of compliance with the imperial 'artifex' to which a Stoic philosopher could go. Was it some sense of this, as well as shame at his unstoical style of life, now once more urged against him in 62, and the loss by death of Burrus' support, which produced his revulsion or 'conversion' from his wholly impossible role as Nero's mentor? Or had he, perhaps, written the Apollo poem with his tongue in his cheek all the time, and had it begun to leak out that he was by no means sincere in his encouragement of Nero's tastes? At any rate, the subtlety of the accusations brought against the philosopher at this date by the Emperor's evil geniuses (*deteriores*) were on those lines: 'obiciebant etiam . . . carmina crebrius factitare, postquam Neroni amor eorum venisset. nam oblectamentis principis palam iniquum detrectare vim eius equos regentis, includere voces, quoties caneret.'²

APPENDIX

It remains to consider whether the alternative date suggested for the publication of the *Apocolocyntosis* throws any light on the notoriously obscure passage in c. 8:

'non tulisset illud, nedum ab Iove, quem quantum quidem in illo fuit damnavit incesti. Silanum enim generum suum occidit propterea quod sororem suam, festivissimam omnium puellarum, quam omnes Venerem vocarent, maluit Iunonem vocare.'³ "quare", inquit "quaero enim, sororem suam?" Stulte, stude: Athenis

tantum fruges nec confusum metallis aurum gigni, sed nova ubertate provenire terram et obvias opes deferre deos.'

¹ It may be pleaded in explanation of these murders that Claudius was perpetually harassed and menaced by dangerous conspiracies bred in senatorial and equestrian circles. The gibe about injustice contained in 'illum altera tantum parte audita condemnat' (*Apocol.* 14) looks like a distortion of Claudius' ruling that if one of the parties to a suit failed, after summons, to appear at the trial, the jury should decide in favour of the party present (*Berlin. griech. Urkunden*, 611). To his love of litigation there was another

side—his sincere desire to reform abuses; while his use of freedmen in the civil service and extension of the franchise were an obvious defiance of conservative tradition.

² Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv. 52. It is possible that we may detect Seneca stealthily poking fun at Nero *poeta* in the two sly hits which he deals the poets in the *Apocolocyntosis*. In c. 2 he laughs at their way of describing the date and hour of Claudius' death. In c. 12 the dirge for Claudius includes the line 'vosque poetae luete novi' (for Claudius' patronage of poetry cf. Suetonius, *Claudius*, 11; Pliny, *Epp.* i. 1. 3).

³ Juno being both wife and sister of Jupiter.

NERO

dimidium
gunt".²
Haase's

The last se
marriage o
though it v
signing of
vividly Su
ἀβλεψία (b
'ducturus
alumnam c
revealed hi
lius with t
sed aliis ge
argument t
with his si
Claudius, A
with the di
was alread
favour, bro
had recent
non incestu
Claudius d
Silanus in t
the death o
Octavia, w
Agrippina's
Nero and c
Agrippina v
to face the
put her aw
tences migh

NEWHAM

¹ Marriage
Athens, whi
brother and

² A prover

³ Cf. Tacit
monii sui ign
ἀνάθαρ (sc.

⁴ e.g. Ball-
ber'; Rouse
his own close

dimidium licet, Alexandriae totum.¹ "quia Romae" inquis "mures molas lingunt".² hic nobis curva corriget? quid in cubiculo suo faciat, nescit ["nescio" in Haase's Teubner edition, 1898].

The last sentence is often interpreted as alluding to Claudius' ignorance of the mock marriage of Silius and Messallina.³ But this can only be done if *faciat* be read as though it were *fiat* or *faciant*.⁴ Again, *faciat* might refer to Claudius' absent-minded signing of the marriage contract for that pair.⁵ But the sentence recalls still more vividly Suetonius' illustration of the Emperor's *μερεωπία* (absent-mindedness) and *ἀβλεψία* (blindness) apropos of his incestuous marriage with his niece Agrippina: 'ducturus contra fas Agrippinam uxorem, non cessavit omni oratione filiam et alumnam et in gremio suo natam atque educatam praedicare.'⁶ When Claudius revealed his project in 49, the incestuous union was defended in the Senate by Vitellius with the following argument: 'at enim nova nobis in fratrum filias coniugia: sed aliis gentibus sollemnia, neque lege ulla prohibita.'⁷ Now this is just the very argument used in our passage of the *Apocolocyntosis* in defence of Silanus' 'incest' with his sister. According to Tacitus' account⁸ of the condemnation of Silanus by Claudius, Agrippina, scheming for a marriage between Nero and Octavia, was faced with the difficulty that the union 'sine scelere perpetrari non poterat', since Octavia was already betrothed to Silanus. Vitellius as censor, seeking to win Agrippina's favour, brought a charge against Silanus, whose *decora et procax soror*, Junia Calvina, had recently been married to Vitellius' son: 'hinc initium accusationis; fratrumque non incestum, sed incustoditum amorem ad infamiam traxit.' As a result of this Claudius dissolved the engagement between Silanus and Octavia. This defence of Silanus in the *Apocolocyntosis* and the accusation against Claudius of having caused the death of an innocent man, seems to hint that Nero should never have married Octavia, whose betrothal to Silanus had always been valid. Such 'back-handers' at Agrippina's incestuous marriage with Claudius and illegal match-making between Nero and Octavia could hardly have been published for court consumption while Agrippina was still alive, i.e. before 59. As far back as 55 Seneca and Burrus had had to face the fact that Nero had already conceived an aversion for Octavia.⁹ In 62 he put her away.¹⁰ In 60 a veiled suggestion that he had married her under false pretences might not have been unwelcome.

JOCELYN M. C. TOYNBEE.

NEWMHAM COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ Marriage with a half-sister being allowed at Athens, while in the Egyptian royal family brother and sister were commonly mated.

² A proverb of obscure significance.

³ Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* xi. 13, 'at Claudius matrimonii sui ignarus'; Dio, 60. 31, τὸν γοῦν Κλαύδιον ἐλάνθανεν (sc. Messallina).

⁴ e.g. Ball—'what goes on in his own chamber'; Rouse (Loeb edition)—'what goes on in his own closet'; Weinreich—'was sie in seinem

Schlafzimmer treiben'.

⁵ Suetonius, *Claudius*, 29, 'nam illud omnem fidem excessit quod nuptiis quas Messallina cum adultero Siliio fecerat, tabellas dotis et ipse consignaverit'.

⁶ Suetonius, *Claudius*, 39.

⁷ Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 6.

⁸ *Ann.* xii. 3, 4.

⁹ *Ibid.* xiii. 12.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* xiv. 60.

THE GROWTH OF THE GREEK 'APMONIAI'

IN Book III (398 D-399 E) of the *Republic*, where Plato is discussing the musical education of his φύλακες, he speaks of certain ἀρμονίαι by name. It is well known that Aristides Quintilianus has preserved a list of ἀρμονίαι, with their names and sequences of intervals, which he declares to be the ἀρμονίαι named in Plato's *Republic*.² I transcribe these sequences of intervals in descending order, as follows:

Dorian .	.	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	Mixolydian .	3	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Phrygian .	.	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	Syntonolydian	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$			
Lydian .	.	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	$\frac{1}{2}$		Ionian.	.	1	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	

Before these sequences can be translated into notation, their relative pitches must be ascertained. Recent scholars have established beyond reasonable doubt that the Greek ἀρμονίαι were modal, not tonic, in character; but in reacting against the untenable 'key-theories' of Monro and Macran, they have rejected incontrovertible evidence that different ἀρμονίαι had different pitches or registers. The terms σύντροφος and ἀνεμμένη—*taut* and *slack*—used as technical terms in a music of string instruments, could not possibly mean anything but *high* and *low*; and Aristotle's statement that old men cannot sing τὰς συντόνους ἀρμονίας cannot be otherwise explained without absurdity.³

Accordingly, we must pitch the Syntonolydian relatively high; and since Damon identified the Ionian with the ἐπανεμμένη Λυδιστί,⁴ the Ionian must be pitched low. The later Mixolydian was the B mode, lying low on the later diapason a¹-A. But Aristophanes, after quoting a poem by Lamprocles, adds: ἐντεταμένους τὴν ἀρμονίαν ἣν οἱ πατέρες παρέδωκαν: and the Scholiast remarks: ὡς συντόνου οὔσης τῆς παλαιᾶς ἀρμονίας, οὐκ ἀνεμμένης, ὡς οἱ νέοι ἐπενόησαν—the old ἀρμονία was high, not low, as the moderns afterwards conceived it.⁵ Now Lamprocles is associated with the Mixolydian ἀρμονία.⁴ It is therefore probable that the Mixolydian is the ἀρμονία here referred to; and we may provisionally suppose that the old Mixolydian was pitched on the higher b octave.

Aristides' scales may now be arranged in alphabetical notation, as follows:⁶

Dorian	e ¹	c ^b	a	f ^{ee}	d
Phrygian	d ¹	c ^b	a	f ^{ee}	d
Lydian	ēe ¹	c ^b	a	f ^ē	
Mixolydian	.	.	b ¹	.	f ^{ee}	c ^b			
Syntonolydian	.	.	.	g ¹	e ¹	c ^b			
Ionian		a	g	e	c ^{bb}

Aristides mentions these ἀρμονίαι because their scale-divisions differed somewhat from those of the later standard types. He had, of course, no evidence that Plato, in the *Republic*, was thinking of these enharmonic genera rather than of the diatonic forms of the same names. As a matter of fact, Plato has told us that he strongly

¹ For a fuller discussion of the musical side of this subject, v. my forthcoming article in the *Music Review*, Feb. 1943.

² The antiquity of these ἀρμονίαι has been ably demonstrated by J. F. Mountford, *C.Q.*, 1923, and *J.H.S.* 1920.

³ *Ar., Politics*, 1342^b. On Pratinas and Lasos, v. *infra*, p. 99. Monro (*Modes of Greek Music*)

and Macran (in his edition of Aristoxenus) collect the evidence for the pitching of the ἀρμονίαι, though they draw false inferences.

⁴ Ps.-Plut., *De Musica*, 16.

⁵ *Clouds*, 967-8.

⁶ Transcriptions are in the natural key. ē represents the quarter-tone above e. My notation repeats at D-d-d¹.

disapprove
ἀναμετροῦν
παραβάλλον
εἶναι τοῦτο
ἀμφότεροι δ
of σύμφωνοι
tones. He
he admired
and also (if
sang in the
genera, and
in the earl
diatonic for

But a
form which
of the two
purely con
Plutarch sh
was cut up
diatonic m
the same r
structural
correspond

Aristide
modes, ma
forms whos
quarter-ton
these diato

The foll
short of an
be explaine
in the diat
transilient

But no
treat as st
scales; and
ἀρμονία: τῇ
That is, th

¹ *Republic*,
35 B). The q
to the enharm
That they
memory is s
ἄλλα ὀνομάζον
unit of measu
authentic, Eu
(cf. *infra*, p.
² *De Mus.*
form, becaus
had (as he

disapproved of quarter-tones:¹ τὰς γὰρ ἀκουόμενας αὐ συμφωνίας καὶ φθόγγους ἀλλήλοις ἀναμετροῦντες ἀνήνυτα ποιοῦσι . . . καὶ γελοῖως γε, πυκνῶματ' ἅττα ὀνομάζοντες καὶ παραβάλλοντες τὰ ὦτα . . . οἱ μὲν φασιν ἔτι κατακούειν ἐν μέσῳ τινα ἤχην, καὶ συμκρότατον εἶναι τοῦτο δίδωσθαι, ᾧ μετρητέον, οἱ δὲ ἀμφισβητοῦντες ὡς ὅμοιον ἦδη φθεγγομένων, ἀμφότεροι ὦτα τοῦ νοῦ προσητησάμενοι. According to Plato, music should be the study of σύμφωνοι ἀριθμοί, perfect consonances—not of irrational and indeterminate micro-tones. He would never have educated his Guardians on enharmonic music. That he admired the diatonic genus we know: he used it for his ideal scale in the *Timaeus*, and also (if the word *συμφωνεῖν* implies perfect consonances) for the scale the Sirens sang in the Dream of Er. Since Aristoxenus says the diatonic was the oldest of the genera, and since Pseudo-Plutarch² refers to a diatonic Mixolydian ἁρμονία existing in the early fifth century, it is beyond doubt that the ἁρμονίαι of Aristides had diatonic forms as well as enharmonic.

But a diatonic *ἀρμονία* cannot immediately be deduced from the enharmonic form which bears the same name. A comparison between the later standard modes of the two genera will show that the nominal correspondence between the two is purely conventional and artificial. The original enharmonic scale (as the pseudo-Plutarch shows)³ was in the Dorian octave only. Its ultimate form, **E' CĒB A FĒE**, was cut up into other modes, which were named according to the pitch-order of the diatonic modes. But a gapped genus, treated in this way, cannot possibly preserve the same registers as the diatonic modes in every case; and there is no necessary structural connexion between the two. Thus the bottom notes of the nominally corresponding octaves diverge as follows:

<i>Diatonic</i>	.	.	.	G	F	E	D	C	B	A
<i>Enharmonic</i>	.	.	.	F	\bar{E}	E	C	\bar{B}	B	A

Aristides' *ἀρμονίαι*, which are half-formed ancestors of the later enharmonic modes, may be expected to show somewhat similar divergences from the diatonic forms whose names they have borrowed. Still, so far as the incidence of the gaps and quarter-tones will allow, they will no doubt correspond roughly to the registers of these diatonic forms.

The following points may be noticed about Aristides' ἀρμονίαι. Two of them stop short of an octave, and one—the Mixolydian—has a gap from **b** to **f**. This cannot be explained by the ordinary gapping of enharmonic forms, which would not occur in the diatonic genus. The Aristoxenian term ὑπερβατόν, meaning a gapped or transilient scale, would be applicable here.

But no scale can be interpreted unless we know which notes a composer would treat as structurally important in his tunes. Music, as Parry said, comes before scales; and Heraclides Ponticus has observed this historical fact in his definition of a *ἁρμονία*: τὴν ἀγωγὴν τῆς μελωδίας ἣν οἱ Δωριεῖς ἐποιούοντο Δώριον ἐκάλουν ἁρμονίαν.⁴ That is, the consecutive note-series of the Dorian corpus of songs was called the

¹ *Republic*, 531 A-C (cf. 617 B and *Timaeus*, 35 B). The quarter-tones were a later addition to the enharmonic style (cf. Appendix I, p. 103). That they were introduced within Plato's memory is strongly suggested by 'πικνύμαρ' ἔττα ὀνομάζοντες', and by the dispute about the unit of measurement. If the *Orestes* fragment is authentic, Euripides was using them by 408 B.C. (cf. *infra*, p. 100).

² *De Mus.* 16. He must mean the diatonic form, because the enharmonic could not have had (as he states) the opposite sequence of

intervals to the ἐπανεῖμένη Λυδιστί.

³ *v. infra*, Appendix I, p. 103. It cannot be too emphatically stated that the enharmonic and diatonic genera had (as one would expect of any two musical genera) different origins and histories. To expect the different genera of each mode to follow the same pattern or structure is fantastic. The modes of each genus are derived from the basic scale of that genus, not from the nominally related modes of another genus.

* ap. Athen. 624 D.

Dorian *ἀρμονία*. The *ἀρμονίαι* were not the rigid, independent scale-forms or *συστήματα* of later times: in fact, a *ἀρμονία* does not really mean a scale, any more than a 'mode' does. It means a style based on certain relations of notes. Aristides clearly and correctly describes *ἀρμονία* in terms of *μελωδία*, from which it is scarcely distinguishable; and Euripides practically identifies the two: *μέλπει δ' ἐν δένδρεσι λεπτὰν ἀηδὼν ἀρμονίαν*.¹

Can we, then, discover anything about the principles of tune-making from which the *ἀρμονίαι* are derived?

In the *Problems*² we are told that a good tune recurs often to the *μέση*. It is much disputed whether the *μέση* is here to be understood *κατὰ θέσιν* (relatively, as the fourth from the bottom note of any *ἀρμονία*) or *κατὰ δύναμιν* (absolutely, as the middle note of the Dorian Greater Perfect System). Obviously, the latter sense is meaningless in a modally varied music—and a glance at the *ἀρμονίαι* of Aristides is enough, apart from other evidence, to show that they do not belong to a single-mode music.³ As a matter of fact, the *ὀνομασία κατὰ δύναμιν* is only the *ὀνομασία κατὰ θέσιν* of the Dorian mode, on whose later predominance the Greater Perfect System is based.⁴ Whether or not the author of the *Problems* was actually thinking of Dorian tunes, it is inconceivable that the *μέση* (*κατὰ θέσιν*) was functionally important in the Dorian *ἀρμονία* only, or that each *ἀρμονία* showed totally different conceptions of the primary intervals of tune-structure. Modal variety demands flexible treatment, but it would be unintelligible without certain principles of composition.

This, however, is not to say that the *μέση* was a 'tonic'. The idea of a tonic is necessarily foreign to any kind of modal music. It was precisely what its name implies: a middle pivot-note. Aristides puts the *μέση* in its place, among the other pivot-notes of Greek tunes.

The notes, he explains, which recur frequently in the tune, or which contain it at top and bottom, determine the character of the *ἀρμονία*.⁵ In any tune, certain notes are more essential than others as clues to the mode or key: it is difficult to indicate the key of C major in a tune using the notes *a c f a'*, but easy in a tune using the notes *b c e g*. In Greek scales, the *μέση* with its fourth below and its fifth above are primary notes. The tuning of the *κιθάρα* begins from these intervals—and intervals are, of course, important in a scale because they are important in a tune. That these top, middle, and bottom notes were important as melodic pivots is indicated by Aristides in his description of different traditional styles of *μελοποιία* as *νητοειδής*, *μεσοειδής*, and *ὑπατοειδής*.⁶ The emphasis of the several pivots varied.

A well-balanced, clearly defined tune would balance itself round some, though not necessarily all, of these pivots. But consciousness of fourths and fifths does not at once imply consciousness of the whole intervening sequence bounded by these intervals. The tune, at certain crises, would jump from one pivot to another: it would not necessarily touch all the intermediate notes. Such a procedure is common

¹ *Phaethon*, fr. 773 (N.).

² 20.

³ The excellent work of Prof. J. F. Mountford and Mr. Winnington-Ingram (*Mode in Greek Music*) has sufficiently established this point.

⁴ Cf. the absolute use, in France or Italy, of sol-fa terms which were originally relative (*v. infra*, p. 102), on this subject.

⁵ 57. 29; 58 *ad init.* Mr. Winnington-Ingram's interpretation of the former passage (*op. cit.*, pp. 57-9) makes no sense to me. *ἀρμονία* and *μελωδία* are naturally connected in Aristides' account (as Mr. W.-Ingram afterwards admits,

p. 60). Cf. for instance, 57. 18: *ἤτοι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ συστήματος ἀγωγὴν τῆς ποιότητος μεταλαμβάνει, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ὑπερβατὸν μελωδίαν τοῖς πλεονάζουσι τῶν ἡχῶν συνεξομοιοῦνται.*

⁶ 19. 10, 20. 1. *ὑπάτη* is the bottom note, a fourth below *μέση*: *νήτη* is the top note, a fifth above. *παραμέση*, a fifth above *ὑπάτη*, gives another important interval which (we may conjecture) would be emphasized in the F mode, since that mode had no true *μέση*. The Greeks could enjoy the *diabolus*, but only as an abnormality (cf. Appendix I).

to the ev
but by lea

With
of the dia

The P
on the M

Lydian st
what was

anatomy
used to a

already t
Lydian st

change th
new song.

We wi
series g' f'

four notes
register co

associated
his own in

importanc
touch the

below the
normally t

down his
'Low Lyd

To tak
b and the

But the in
the *μέση* e'

ἀρμονία b'
version b'

the g' strin

This in
ἀρμονία inc

tion of it.
that the di

doing? He
upper edge

of interval

the *ἀρμονία*
bounded by

My poin
it left a rea

space betw

¹ This sca
dating of the

² 'Athens'
Hellenic cult

of course am
from folk-sor

Kunstmusik

to the evolution of all music: tunes are not formed by stringing notes consecutively, but by leaping first to some primary interval, which is filled in afterwards.

With these points in mind, I shall put forward a hypothesis on which the growth of the diatonic ἀρμονία seems to me to be explained.

The Phrygian song sung on the banks of the Sangarius, or the Lydian song sung on the Maeander, was not very like the songs sung at Athens in the Phrygian or Lydian styles. In all their arts, the Greeks hellenized what was foreign, and civilized what was rustic or provincial. The Lydian ἀρμονία, by Heraclides' definition, was the anatomy of the Lydian μελωδία. This anatomy was analysed by Greek ears, already used to a certain sequence of intervals, and was translated to Greek instruments already tuned to that sequence of intervals. To get a fair approximation to the Lydian style, the Greek made the song fit the notes he already knew: he need not change the basic scale of his κιθάρα, if he chose the right segment of that scale for the new song.

We will suppose that his κιθάρα could play eleven notes, normally tuned to the series **g' f' e' d' c b a g f e d**.¹ This Lydian song—let us imagine—occupied only the four notes **a g f e**, and its chief recurrent note was the **f**. So **a g f e** became the register conventionally used at Athens² for 'Low Lydian' songs, and they were associated with the recurrent **f**. Presently the Greek wanted to compose songs of his own in this style. He had his own Greek notions of composition, and of the importance of certain intervals in a tune. In particular, the tunes he wrote tended to touch the fourth below the middle pivot-note which he called μέση. But the fourth below the Lydian **f** was beyond the compass of his κιθάρα, whose bottom string was normally tuned to **d**. However, the Lydian style did not demand that **d**, so he tuned down his **d** string to **c**. This *scordatura* left him with a gap between **e** and **c**: his new 'Low Lydian' ἀρμονία was **a g f e c**.³

To take another example: songs in the style called Mixolydian had the ὑπάρχη **b** and the μέση **e'**. From this **e'** the Greek could run continuously up to **g'**, if he chose. But the interval **g'-e'** was useless and unimportant: what he wanted was a fifth above the μέση **e'**. Accordingly, he tuned up his top **g'** string to **b'**, and obtained a Mixolydian ἀρμονία **b' f' e' d' c b**. This is, I suggest, the diatonic form of Aristides' enharmonic version **b' f#e' d' cbb**, with its curious gap at the top, produced by a *scordatura* of the **g'** string.

This interpretation corresponds to the early high register of the Mixolydian ἀρμονία indicated by Aristophanes and his Scholiast. But there is further confirmation of it. We are told that Lamprocles, in the early fifth century, first discovered that the disjunction of the Mixolydian ἀρμονία lay at the top.⁴ What was Lamprocles doing? He was analysing the gap **b-f** where the Mixolydian ἀρμονία leaped off the upper edge of the charted notes **g'-d** of the κιθάρα. Prolonging the existing sequence of intervals by repeating the lower Mixolydian tetrachord, he diagnosed the form of the ἀρμονία as follows: **b' || [a' g'] f' e' d' c b**. That is, the higher tetrachord was bounded by the omitted note **a'**, while the disjunction lay between **a'** and **b'**.

My point is that when the high **b'** had been produced by tuning up the **g'** string, it left a real gap or hiatus in the known series of notes, charted on the κιθάρα. The space between the new **b'** and the old **g'** was unmapped, undivided, ἀπειρον: no

¹ This scale is derived from my analysis and dating of the ἀρμονία (*v. infra*, pp. 98-9).

² 'Athens' is to be understood as an inter-Hellenic cultural centre. Ionian musicians were of course among the leaders in the development from folk-song (Greek or barbarous) to a Greek *Kunstmusik* (*cf. infra*, p. 99).

³ This corresponds to Aristides' Ionian ἀρμονία (which was similar to the Low Lydian—*v. infra*, pp. 98 and 99-100).

⁴ Ps.-Plut. *De Mus.* 16. The disjunction is the tone which, added to the two similar tetrachords, makes up the octave.

analysis would have been necessary if the intervening notes had already existed on the *κιθάρα*. What Lamprocles discovered was the principle of tetrachordal analysis of the *ἀρμονίαι*, by which the gap could be filled in. This was the first step towards the continuous two-octave diapason of later times, and towards the completion of the *ἀρμονίαι* as full octave-species.

I will recapitulate my explanation of the growth of the early *ἀρμονίαι*:

- (1) Foreign or provincial songs were assimilated to a common set of instruments with a standard scale—each corpus of songs being adapted to the segment of that scale which best fitted it. This was how the *ἀρμονίαι* acquired their different conventional pitches.
- (2) Greek principles of composition demanded certain intervals, relative to the existing pivots of the tunes, as fundamental in balancing the song and defining its *ἀρμονία*. But since the compass of the *κιθάρα* was limited, such intervals could not always be obtained on its normal tuning. If the middle pivot of a song lay near the edge of the compass of the *κιθάρα*, the top or bottom strings had to be tuned up or down to the required note, leaving a gap in the *ἀρμονία* of the song.

This hypothesis not only explains how some *ἀρμονίαι* came to be gapped, but also combines the ancient evidence for the modal character of the *ἀρμονίαι* with the ancient evidence for their distinctive pitches. In combining both sets of evidence, it does not involve the anachronistic assumption that the *ἀρμονίαι* were complete octave-species of a 15-note system, at a time when no such system can be postulated. On the contrary, it explains how the 15-note system grew together gradually, by filling in the gaps of such transilient *ἀρμονίαι* as the Mixolydian.

It is now possible to guess the diatonic forms of Aristides' other *ἀρμονίαι*. I transcribe them beneath the normal diatonic tuning of the *κιθάρα*, from which they are derived:

Normal Scale			<i>g</i> ¹	<i>f</i> ¹	<i>e</i> ¹	<i>d</i> ¹	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>d</i>
Dorian . . .					<i>e</i> ¹	<i>d</i> ¹	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>d</i>
Phrygian . . .						<i>d</i> ¹	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>d</i>
Lydian . . .				<i>f</i> ¹	<i>e</i> ¹	<i>d</i> ¹	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>f</i>		
Mixolydian . . .	<i>b</i> ¹			<i>f</i> ¹	<i>e</i> ¹	<i>d</i> ¹	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>					
Syntonolydian . . .			<i>g</i> ¹	<i>f</i> ¹	<i>e</i> ¹	<i>d</i> ¹	<i>c</i>						
Ionian . . .									<i>a</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>C</i>

The first three *ἀρμονίαι* fall wholly within the normal compass of the *κιθάρα*, so that all the notes of a continuous octave are available if required. Dorian songs, indeed, use a ninth note below the *ὑπάρη e*. The Lydian enharmonic version of Aristides is the same as the later standard enharmonic form, running from *e*¹ to *e*, which was called by the name of the diatonic *F* mode: it is therefore to be presumed that the diatonic forms also correspond.

The later enharmonic forms show quarter-tones falling below the diatonic *ὑπάρη* in the case of the *F* and *C* modes. Accordingly, the Syntonolydian and Ionian *ἀρμονίαι* are best interpreted as stretching to the pivot-notes *c* and *C* respectively, without the *πικρὰ bb* and *EB*. Both, in fact, seem to centre round the pivots *C, F*, and *G*¹ and since Damon identified the Ionian with the *ἐπανεμένη Λυδιστί*, it is not surprising to find that it also resembles the *σύντροφος Λυδιστί* an octave higher. But Ionian songs, for some traditional reason, went up to the *A*; moreover, they had

¹ Any interpretation of such fragmentary *ἀρμονίαι* must be provisional. For their later history, *v. infra*, p. 100; but their completion as octave-species was somewhat arbitrary. The

enharmonic forms were evidently attracted by the Dorian enharmonic prototype. The Ionian enharmonic needs the *d* string tuned down to *B*, *CBB* being played on one string (*v. p. 99*).

to obtain
lydian *ἀρ*

It is
the addi
a basic s
pentaton
strings.¹
both fro
Lamproc
pitches h
βρομος':
the Aeoli
pleted as
κιθάρα: t
went dow
statement

There
tuned to
sixth cer
elements
distortion
them, rep
of tune-m
ancient a
bear the m
of songs a
But there
range, for
the Greek
not have

We ca
species. T
to *C*; the
compass a
diatonic s
octave.

By the
ἀρμονία ha
tetrachord
disappears
formed, it
system: it

On this
attribute
ἐπανεμένη

¹ Cf. Sack
vi (1923-4),

² One was
from *g*¹ to *g*
perhaps hav

to obtain one of their pivots by a *scordatura*, which was not necessary in the Syntonydian *ἀρμονία*.

It is possible that by the fifth century this *scordatura* was made unnecessary by the addition of another string at the bottom of the *κithára*. But my hypothesis of a basic system of eleven notes allows for the sixth-century *κithára* of eight strings, pentatonically tuned, in which **C** and **F** were produced by stopping the **B** and **E** strings.¹ That these *ἀρμονίαι* date back to the sixth century seems extremely probable, both from the fact that the Mixolydian must have existed for some time before Lamprocles, and from the presumption that the *ἀρμονίαι* had acquired conventional pitches by the time of Pratinas and Lasos. Lasos calls the Aeolian *ἀρμονία* 'βαρὶς-βρομος': Pratinas places it between the High and the Low Ionian. Aristides omits the Aeolian, because Plato does not mention it;² but we know that it was later completed as an A mode. Most probably it ran from **a** down to the bottom **d** of the *κithára*: thus it would be *βαρὶς-βρομος*, but still not so low as the Low Ionian, which went down to **C**. Lasos may have been a tenor and Pratinas a baritone: but their statements do not conflict, as has been supposed.

There must, of course, have been a time when each musician had his instrument tuned to his native mode in the register best fitted to his voice. But by the end of the sixth century an inter-Hellenic musical convention had grown up. Barbarous elements and native folk-song alike had been transformed—doubtless with much distortion—into an educated Greek *Kunstmusik*. The *ἀρμονίαι*, as Lamprocles knew them, represent a highly artificial music, moulded into shape by Greek principles of tune-making, and adapted to the limitations of the Greek *κithára* (which, like all ancient and sanctified instruments, was slow to accept innovations). These *ἀρμονίαι* bear the marks of composers rather than of theorists: they are the schemes or skeletons of songs actually sung, and have not yet been dissected and completed by scholars. But there is nothing primitive or foreign about them. Some of them are limited in range, for the songs were still austere and classical; but they had the consonances of the Greek scale and the melodic structure of the Greek composer. Such music need not have been ill-matched with the odes of Pindar and the choruses of Aeschylus.

PART II

We can now perceive the relation between the *ἀρμονίαι* and the later octave-species. The diatonic forms of the early *ἀρμονίαι*, taken together, stretch from **b'** to **C**; the enharmonic forms from **b'** to **B**. Once the gaps at top and bottom of this compass are filled in by a tetrachordal analysis of the *ἀρμονίαι*, a continuous 15-note diatonic scale will be obtained, and the *ἀρμονίαι* will all become full species of the octave.

By the time of Aristophanes' *Clouds* (423 B.C.), as we have seen, the Mixolydian *ἀρμονία* had been moved down an octave. When Lamprocles had filled in its upper tetrachord, the tessitura of the songs must have been found too high. So the high **b'** disappeared, and when the 15-note scale of the Greater Perfect System was eventually formed, it was a scale **a'-A**, instead of **b'-B**. Either would have suited the Dorian system: it was the pitch that determined the choice.

On this new scale the *ἀρμονίαι* were completed and rearranged. We may perhaps attribute part of this work to Damon, who identified the Ionian *ἀρμονία* with the *ἐναεμένη Ἀυδιστί*, and apparently completed it as an F mode. This is to be deduced

¹ Cf. Sachs, *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, vi (1923-4), p. 289.

² One would have expected a *ἀρμονία* running from **g'** to **g**, as well as the Aeolian. This may perhaps have been the old Locrian, which went

out of fashion in the earlier fifth century. Its name was afterwards given to an A mode, but the Aristoxenians used any handy obsolete name to christen their new scales.

from the pseudo-Plutarch, who says it had the opposite sequence of intervals to the Mixolydian or B mode; and it also accounts for Heraclides' remark that the Ionian is *τρόπος τις θαυμαστός σχήματος ἁρμονίας*.¹ The F mode had no true μέση, being divisible into two augmented fourths. In an age which had become conscious of the tetrachordal analysis originated by Lamprocles, this began to seem odd.

The Lydian name, which had belonged to the old *ἁρμονία* $\sharp 1-2$, was now given to the C mode. The exchange of names between the Lydian and Ionian *ἁρμονίαι* is more apparent than real. Low Ionian corresponds to Low Lydian, High Ionian² probably corresponds to High Lydian. In fact, Ionian and Lydian music were the same—not unnaturally, since the Ionians lived in Lydia. There were no doubt some differences of melodic style and convention, but these must gradually have been merged when the *ἁρμονίαι* were schematized as octave-scales.

It is not, of course, to be thought that the older *ἁρμονίαι* went suddenly out of use. Here, as in Lamprocles' case, theory did go before practice. The old names lingered on; the obsolescent terms *σύντονος* and *ἀνεμένη* or *χαλαρά* were still applied to the *ἁρμονίαι*, at least in amateur circles. Composers probably clung to the notes of a gapped scale in order to preserve the traditional *ῥθος*, even after it had been rounded off as an octave-species.

Plato lags far behind the professional theory of his time. He uses the old names of the *ἁρμονίαι*; he refers to Damon; and he talks of the quarter-tones (which Euripides had used in 408 or earlier) as if they were a brand-new stunt. This need not astonish us. Old music dies hard; and many educated people to-day, if they speak of modern music, are really thinking of the innovations of Debussy rather than of Bartok.

How far had music developed by the beginning of the fourth century? To answer this question we must look at Heraclides Ponticus (fl. c. 390 B.C.).³ I shall take some of his statements and ask upon what assumptions they become intelligible—if not intelligent. I transcribe the relevant passages:

- (1) Athen. 624 C. 'Ηρακλείδης δὲ ὁ Ποντικός ἐν τρίτῳ περὶ μουσικῆς οὐδ' ἁρμονίαν φησὶ δεῖν καλεῖσθαι τὴν φρύγιον, καθάπερ οὐδὲ τὴν λυδίον. ἁρμονίας γὰρ εἶναι τρεῖς· τρία γὰρ καὶ γένεσθαι Ἑλλήνων γένη, Δωριεῖς Αἰολεῖς Ἴωνες.
- (2) 625 A. πρότερον μὲν οὖν, ὡς ἔφην, αἰολίδα αὐτὴν ἐκάλου, ὕστερον δὲ ὑποδώριον, ὥσπερ ἐννοί φασιν, ἐν τοῖς αὐλοῖς τετάχθαι νομίσαντες αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τὴν δώριον ἁρμονίαν. ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ ὁρῶντας αὐτοὺς τὸν ὄγκον . . . ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἁρμονίας ῥθμοῖς δώριον μὲν αὐτὴν οὐ νομίζω, προσεμφερῆ δὲ πῶς ἐκέλευ.
- (3) 625 D. καταφρονητέον οὖν τῶν τὰς μὲν κατ' εἶδος διαφορὰς οὐ δυναμένων θεωρεῖν, ἐπακολουθούντων δὲ τῇ τῶν φθόγων δξύτητι καὶ βαρύτητι,
- (4) καὶ τιθεμένων ὑπερμιξολύδιον ἁρμονίαν καὶ πάλιν ὑπὲρ ταύτης ἄλλην.
- (5) οὐχ ὁρῶ γὰρ οὔτε τὴν ὑπερφρύγιον ἴδιον ἔχουσαν ῥθος· καίτοι τινὲς φασιν ἄλλην ἐξευρηκέναι καὶ τὴν ἁρμονίαν ὡς ὑποφρύγιον†.
- (6) δεῖ δὲ τὴν ἁρμονίαν εἶδος ἔχειν ῥθμοῦς ἢ πάθους,
- (7) καθάπερ ἡ λοκριστί. ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐννοί τῶν γενομένων κατὰ Σιμωνίδην καὶ Πίνδαρον ἐχρήσαντό ποτε, καὶ πάλιν κατεφρονήθη.

§§ 3 and 6 tell us that a *ἁρμονία* can be distinguished from other *ἁρμονίαι* both by its pitch and by its *εἶδος* or sequence of intervals—which is what we should expect from our previous conclusions—but that the latter is the correct or essential criterion. How, then, can Heraclides plausibly reduce the seven *ἁρμονίαι* to three? Or rather,

¹ Ps.-Plut. *De Mus.* 16; ap. Athen. 625 D.

² Mentioned by Pratinas: v. *supra*, p. 99.

³ Mr. Winnington-Ingram (op. cit., p. 20, n. 3) suggests that Athenaeus himself, not Heraclides, wrote most of Athen. 624 C–625 F. But how

could Athenaeus be talking about new Hypermixolydian and Hyperphrygian *ἁρμονίαι*, at his date? The phrases *ὡς ἔφην* and *ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἶπομεν* show that he is quoting, as usual, in *oratio recta*.

to four :
ἁρμονία

On this explained octave-scale in Heraclides' Greek music (below) the denotes that if the Dorian reduction is ponent to other three of the diatonic idea that to their tetrachord arbitrary. three relations choose to fluous.²

I will *ὑποφρύγιον*. It would be and yet so repeated.

The H. But there point is the new 15-note the A mode.

So far, Lamprocles happening *ταύτης*, of mode **b-B**. the diatonic transposed reproduces

Heraclides pitch. But and \sharp int from their And this p Aristoxenus superseded you did not

¹ Cf. Apper *ὑπερ-* and *ὑπο-*

² Cf. *supra* of these modes

³ It is not misnamed the

to four; for he admits (§ 7) that the obsolete Locrian fulfilled the conditions of a true ἀρμονία.

On the hypotheses I have already put forward Heraclides' argument can be explained. Following the initiative of Lamprocles, the ἀρμονίαι had become full octave-species and were analysed by tetrachords. This tetrachordal analysis is implied in Heraclides' use of the terms ὑπερ- and ὑπο- prefixed to the names of modes.¹ In Greek musical terminology, ὑπερ- denotes the mode pitched a fifth above (or a fourth below) the original mode to whose uncompounded name it is prefixed; while ὑπο- denotes the mode pitched a fifth below (or a fourth above) that original mode. Thus, if the Dorian mode is e'-e, the Hyperdorian is b'-b and the Hypodorian a-A. The reduction of the modes to four follows naturally from a consciousness of their component tetrachords. Only four modes have distinct and peculiar tetrachords: the other three repeat the same tetrachords, and are distinguished only by the position of the disjunction relatively to the ὑπάτη. Heraclides (§§ 4-6) is obsessed with the idea that ἀρμονίαι must be modally distinct; and he seems to be applying this principle to their tetrachords as well as to their complete octaves. His selection is, of course, arbitrary. He had no right to say that any three modes had a better title than their three related modes. But, on a tetrachordal analysis, he had a right to say: 'If I choose to select the E, A, and F modes, then the B, D, and C modes become superfluous.'²

I will next take § 5. This sentence demands the emendation ὑπερφρύγιον for ὑποφρύγιον: a very easy slip of the pen. No other reading will make sense after καίτοι. It would be nonsense to say: 'I can't see that the X mode has any ἦθος of its own either, and yet some people say they have discovered a new Y mode.' ὑπερφρύγιον must be repeated.

The Hyperphrygian lay a fifth above the Phrygian mode d'-d: i.e. the mode a'-a. But there was already a mode a-A, the old Aeolian or Hypodorian (§ 2). Heraclides' point is that the two differ only in pitch, not in εἶδος.³ Here is more evidence of the new 15-note diatonic scale a'-A, whose formation I have traced above. On this scale, the A mode could be repeated in two octaves.

So far, the music of Heraclides' day is only a development of the initiative of Lamprocles, logically worked out. But meanwhile, something new and exciting was happening. What was the so-called Hypermixolydian mode,¹ and the other ὑπὲρ ταύτης, of which Heraclides speaks (§ 4)? The Mixolydian, as we know, was the mode b-B. Tuning up a fifth from b, we reach f#. Continuing on the white notes of the diatonic scale, we get the scale f# e' d' c b a g f#, which is simply the B mode transposed. Similarly, the other mode ὑπὲρ ταύτης begins on c# and (keeping the f#) reproduces the B mode over again.

Heraclides merely growled that these three modes were all the same, except in pitch. But he had missed the point. Somebody had introduced the new notes F# and C# into the diatonic scale, and had thereby found a way of transposing modes from their traditional and natural registers. The idea of transposing modes was new. And this passage proves that it originated not through the τόνος-mechanism of Aristoxenus but through the discovery of 'black notes'. These 'black notes' were superseded by the τόνος-mechanism, because the latter was far more convenient if you did not want key-modulations in the manner of modern music: it enabled you

¹ Cf. Appendix II (*infra*, p. 103) on the terms ὑπερ- and ὑπο-.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 99, and n. 2 for identifications of these modes.

³ It is not necessary to suppose that all who miscalled the Hyperphrygian a 'new mode' failed

to recognize its tonality. Mr. J. D. Denniston (*C.Q.* vii, 1913, p. 85) has observed that ἐπακούουσαν implies a *deliberate* choice of pitch as the criterion of distinction between scales. Heraclides is attacking a new theory, not an ignorant confusion.

to transpose automatically instead of learning new scales on a chromatically constructed instrument.¹ Nevertheless, the 'black notes' were the first means of transposition. This is the answer to the old question: Why did Aristoxenus preserve (in the form of extra *τόνοι*) the 'black notes' which his *τόνος*-mechanism had made superfluous? It was because they were real, known notes; they had dominated musical practice for two generations of transition, and had pointed the way towards the *τόνος*-system. Aristoxenus, piously or pedantically, preserved the pioneers.

The discovery of the *F* \sharp and *C* \sharp is to be related to the invention of new instruments which could play all the *ἀρμονίαι*. Pronomus, Alcibiades' music-master, constructed an *αὐλός* of this kind;² and Plato mentions *αὐλοὶ* and harps which he calls *παναρμόνια*. Were they two-octave diatonic instruments, playing each mode in its natural register, or twelve-note instruments with a *B* \flat , playing four of the modes in their natural registers and the other three transposed? I think the latter. It was probably difficult to play two octaves on an ancient wind-instrument; and moreover, we should expect that *B* \flat was discovered before *F* \sharp and *C* \sharp . The *παναρμόνια* therefore belong to the experiments in transposition which we find reflected in Heraclides Ponticus.

It need not surprise us to find so many Aristoxenian ideas already current about 400 B.C.³ On the contrary, it would be surprising if this were not so. The *ἀρμονίαι* which were gapped or incomplete in Lamprocles' day are found neatly and symmetrically worked out by the time of Heraclides: the experiments in transposition which are new, fragmentary, and uncoded in Heraclides' day will be found reduced to a logical system by the time of Aristoxenus. Practice goes before theory, music before scales. The creative ferment—as the historian would expect—lasted down to the death of Plato. Then, when it had subsided, it was time for Aristotle's pupil to reduce the chaotic practice to the methodical system, and to grasp its essential features with his formidable common sense.

The effect of the discovery of key-transposition was, naturally, to reduce the early variety of modes to one predominant scale: the Dorian. In this period—which was also a period of musical theory and scholarship—the old relative names of the notes were fixed absolutely to the notes of the Dorian system. That this naming should have been called the *ὀνομασία κατὰ δύναμιν*—'by function'—shows how complete was the ascendancy of the Dorian mode. About the time of Ptolemy, or not much earlier, the modes revived. They had a long and magnificent history, but in the end they succumbed again to the new sharps and flats, the new experiments in transposition, which were to dominate our own classical music. Renaissance composers repeated, in principle, the revolution which overcame Greek music in the fourth century B.C.

APPENDIX I

The Spondeion and Enharmonic Scales

Ps.-Plutarch, *De Musica* 11, quoting Aristoxenus, describes how 'Olympus' invented the Spondeion and Enharmonic Scales. He calls the Spondeion the first of Olympus' enharmonic compositions, but distinguishes it from the regular enharmonic scale by saying that it did not touch the typical intervals of this scale (nor of the diatonic and chromatic scales either). He says Olympus constructed

¹ The *τόνος*-mechanism, like a *capo tasto*, transposed the entire instrument, which thus dispensed with 'black notes'. But I suspect that Timotheus' lyre (c. 380 B.C.) was built chromatically. Sachs' interpretation of Athen. 637 E-F (in *History of Mus. Instruments*, p. 131) is most unlikely. The addition of C and F strings to a pentatonically tuned lyre would not have been revolutionary, since these notes had long been

used (as stopped notes on the B and E strings); and I do not see how it would have facilitated modulation, as he suggests.

² Athenaeus, 631 E; Pausanias, ix. 12; Plato, *Republic*, 399 C-D.

³ There is no sharp division between the usage of the two terms *ἀρμονία* and *εἶδος τοῦ διὰ πασῶν*. The *ἀρμονίαι* of Heraclides have already evolved into octave-species.

it from the progression augmented intervals v

Moreov Since metr (two diton

A, express

After i register. μέσας ἡμῶν τόνος by ad

After C sequence E

This ac Spondeion as to cheat in his tune

Ps.-Plu the term o its original whole sequ says Ps.-Pl **FABD** **FE** avoids the

The rec 1928) seem He is refer

Mr. Win always incli clides in § disingenuou and therefo grouping w the Aristox vaguely in Hypermixo logic: the καίτοι make names arbit cf. *supra*, p.

If Hera A modes ha four, he pun with Mr. W analysis was

Heraclid The applica application

it from the notes **F**, **A**, and **B**, by passing to the *παρυσία* from the *μέση* or the *παρὰ μέση*. These progressions do, in fact, avoid the typical perfect fourth and fifth, and substitute a major third and augmented fourth, **F-A** and **F-B**. To add **E** below **FAB**, as most scholars do, is to produce the very intervals which the Spondeion is said to have avoided.

Moreover, the term *σπονδειασμός* must have been invented to correspond to the metric form --. Since metric syllables are counted from the ictus, they must be expressed by notes, not by tones (two ditones would represent the foot --υ, not the foot --). An augmented fourth **F-B**, divided at **A**, expressed the form of the spondee.

After inventing the Spondeion, Olympus composed in it *ἐπὶ τοῦ Δωρίου τόνου*: in the Dorian register. Ps.-Plutarch then mentions, as characteristic of the Old Enharmonic music, *τὸ ἐν ταῖς μέσας ἡμιτόνων*; i.e. the semitone **E-F**. This shows that the Spondeion was adapted to the Dorian *τόνος* by adding the Dorian final **E**. The Old Enharmonic scale is thus **BAFE** (read downwards).

After Olympus' time (it is stated) the semitone was divided. (This produced the Enharmonic sequence **B A F E E**).

This account shows clearly that the enharmonic genus was originally an adaptation of the Spondeion to the Dorian *τόνος* only. In no other mode would the progressions described be so placed as to cheat the ear of the perfect fourth or fifth from *μέση* or *παρὰ μέση*, which the Greek expected in his tunes.

Ps.-Plutarch knew a scale which had an upper *σπονδειασμός* as well as a lower. It is true that the term *σπονδειασμός* afterwards became associated with the rise of a $\frac{3}{4}$ tone. But that this was its original meaning is philologically incomprehensible. If we take the *σπονδειασμός* to mean the whole sequence **FAB**, the addition of an upper *σπονδειασμός* would make a scale **FABD#F**. But, says Ps.-Plutarch, the top tone was a quarter tone less than the tone **AB**. The scale would therefore be **FABD#E**. This, he explains, avoids a diatonic interval (viz. the octave interval **F-F**) and also avoids the juxtaposition of a *δίτονος δασύνθετος* and a *δίτονος σύνθετος* (viz. **B-D#** and **AB+D#F**).

The reconstruction of the complete Spondeion scale as **EFABC** (Winnington-Ingram, *C.Q.* xxii, 1928) seems to me to read far too much subtlety into Ps.-Plutarch's statements about intervals. He is referring to the main divisions of the scale, not to small differences between tones.

APPENDIX II

The Use of ὑπερ- and ὑπο-

Mr. Winnington-Ingram (op. cit., p. 20) has suggested that in Heraclides' day *ὑπερ* and *ὑπο* did not always indicate a tetrachordal relation between modes. Two arguments deserve notice: (1) Heraclides in § 2 seems ignorant of the real relation of Hypodorian to Dorian. But here, I believe, he is disingenuously concealing this relation, because he wanted both modes in his chosen group of three, and therefore had to pair off the B mode, instead of the A mode, with the E mode. As the triadic grouping was new and imperfectly grasped, he could get away with his arbitrary selection. (2) In the Aristoxenian system, the name Hypermixolydian corresponds to the mode **a-A**: i.e. *ὑπερ*- was used vaguely in this case (cf. the term *ὑπερπαρὰ*). But (a) Heraclides cannot mean an A mode by his Hypermixolydian. Mr. Winnington-Ingram's interpretation of §§ 4-5 makes neither Greek nor logic: the *οὔτε* shows that the Hypermixolydian and Hyperphrygian are *different* modes, while the *καίτοι* makes the MS. reading *ὑποφρύγιον* nonsensical. (b) The Aristoxenians did use obsolete modal names arbitrarily for their superfluous *τόνοι* and the relative modes (of which the **a-A** mode is one)—cf. *supra*, p. 99, n. 2. Their Hypermixolydian must be another, though an odd, instance.

If Heraclides is using *ὑπερ*- in the usual technical sense, his argument becomes clear. The two A modes have the same *εἶδος*: so have the three modes on **B**, **F#**, and **C#**. In reducing the modes to four, he pursues the same idea: tetrachords, as well as octaves, must have a distinct *εἶδος*. (I agree with Mr. Winnington-Ingram that *ἀρμονίαι* were not originally analysed by tetrachords, but this analysis was certainly discovered by Lamprocles).

Heraclides' Hypodorian is the old *βαρύβρομος* Aeolian mode **a-A**, not the later Hypodorian **a¹-a**. The application of *ὑπερ*- and *ὑπο*- to the *τόνοι* had the natural result of reversing the pitch-order of its application to the modes.

M. I. HENDERSON.

THEOCRITUS, IDYLL XXIV—STARS AND DOORS¹

- 11 ἄμος δὲ στρέφεται μεσονύκτιον ἐς δύσιν Ἄρκτος
 Ὠρίωνα κατ' αὐτόν, ὃ δ' ἀμφαίνει μέγαν ὦμον,
 τᾶμος ἄρ' αἰνὰ πέλωρα δύω πολυμήχανος Ἥρη,
 κυανέαις φρίσσοντας ὑπὸ σπείραισι δράκοντας,
 15 ὥρσεν ἐπὶ πλατὺν οὐδὸν ὅθι σταθμὰ κοῖλα θυράων
 οἶκον, ἀπειλήσασα φαγεῖν βρέφος Ἡρακλῆα.

THE infant twins Herakles and Iphikles have been put to bed and lulled to sleep by their mother, and the stage is set for Hera's assault upon the former, but these lines, in which Theocritus describes its opening phase, present two formidable difficulties. The first is in ll. 11 f. and I cannot solve it, but the commentaries betray so little consciousness of its existence that I make no apology for discussing it.

First, then, let us note that the lines owe something to *Il.* 18. 487 (= *Od.* 5. 273) "Ἀρκτον θ', ἦν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσιν, | ἥ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεῖν, | οἷη δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο. Orion and the Bear are coupled again at Eur. *Ion* 1153 ὃ τε ξιφίρης Ὠρίων, ὑπερθε δὲ | Ἄρκτος στρέφουσι οὐραία χρυσήρη πόλῳ, and στρέφεσθαι has no peculiarly astronomical significance. In these passages² it is used of curved or recurrent celestial tracks or courses as elsewhere of terrestrial. Since the Bear is ἄμμορος λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο, δύσιν will most naturally mean *the west*, and μεσονύκτιον (unless we choose, with Cobet, to write μεσονύκτιος) will be adverbial, as it is at 13. 69. Though, however, the ancients from Homer onwards were better aware than some moderns³ that in their latitudes the Bear never sets, they sometimes speak of its movements after its nearest approach to the horizon as its rising;⁴ and though I do not know that its movements preceding that approach are anywhere called its setting, it seems that they might as logically be so termed, and I do not think that the meaning *setting* is wholly impossible in this passage.

There are two periods of the year at which the midnight sky might be described in such terms as these: (1) When Orion is setting, but his shoulder, the star Betelgeuse, is still above the western horizon. The Bear is then at its highest point and turning downward to the west. (2) When Orion is rising and the Bear is moving eastward near to its lowest point in the sky. Sir Arthur Eddington kindly tells me that in 300 B.C. at latitude 35° N. Betelgeuse set at midnight on February 26, and rose at midnight on August 21. The date provided by solution (1) will therefore be mid-February; that provided by solution (2) the end of August or the beginning of September. As between the two it might perhaps be thought that the verb ἀμφαίνει points to the rising of the constellation.⁵ On the other hand, Orion at that place and date rose on his side, and since shoulder, belt, and foot rose more or less together, specific mention of the shoulder is less natural.⁶ Less natural, too, is the prominence accorded to the Bear, then at its lowest and least conspicuous position in the sky; and as the Bear is

¹ I am indebted for helpful criticism to Professors J. D. Beazley and D. S. Robertson, who read this paper in manuscript; and to Sir Arthur Eddington, who read the first part of it.

² Similarly of the Bear again *Anacreont.* 31. 2; of the moon, Eur. *fr.* 1009; of the tropic of Cancer, Arat. 498; of the equator, *ib.* 512. And at Soph. *Tr.* 130 Ἄρκτου τροφάδες κέλευθοι, *fr.* 432. 11 (where see Pearson) Ἄρκτου τροφάς, the meaning appears to be simply *course*.

³ *The Bear swings to his midnight setting* (Cholmeley), *se tourne vers son coucher* (Legrand), *as soon as the . . . bear had set* (Seaton, translating Ap. Rh. 3. 1195).

⁴ See Housman on Manil. 5. 693.

⁵ At *Il.* 11. 62, the only other place known to me in which the verb is used of stars, it is used not of their rising but as T. uses ἐκφαίνειν at 22. 21.

⁶ Aratus, describing the rising of Orion (587), mentions belt, both shoulders, and sword.

moving
 setting
 descrip
 trust T
 sleeping
 August
 supplie
 there is

At t
 obscure
 require
 will exp
 midnigh
 to conv
 present
 was swi
 month,
 when th
 perhaps
 appeara
 speakin
 not stat

If a
 he will f
 Cambri
 Cholmel
 judged
 I think
 surpris
 a date a
 tur, he s
 poetice n
 'cum me
 of a pro

Wha
 midnigh
 instead
 say befo
 to me in
 astronon
 that Ara
 which w
 than mo
 date fixe
 sky is no

¹ More
 a good p
 than 'sett

² He h
 date is a
 for T.'s.

³ C.Q.

moving eastward we shall have on this interpretation to assign to *δύσω* the meaning *setting* which, as has been said, presents difficulties.¹ On the whole, therefore, the description fits solution (1) better than solution (2), and though it would be rash to trust T.'s consistency too far in such a matter, it may be noted that the children are sleeping in warm blankets (25, 62)—a fact which points to February rather than August. In what follows, therefore, I shall, for brevity's sake, assume the date supplied by ll. 11 f. to be mid-February, and shall ask the reader to remember that there is a possible alternative.

At this point it is necessary to remark that though T. may wish for reasons now obscure to fix the time of year at which these events took place, the immediate requirement of his narrative is that he should indicate some hour of the night which will explain why it is dark and why the household is in bed. The snakes arrived at midnight, as Teiresias presently tells us (92); and *μεσονύκτιον* in 11 might be expected to convey the same information. But as T. has phrased the lines it does not, for his present tenses, *στρέφεται* and *ἀμφαίνει*, stand in the way. If he had said *when the Bear was swinging at midnight towards the west*, etc., he would have fixed both hour and month, and have staged the scene at midnight in February. Since he chooses to say *when the Bear swings at midnight towards the west* he fixes only the month. We may perhaps infer that his choice of midnight as the hour at which to record the seasonal appearance of the sky implies that it was at that hour that the events of which he is speaking occurred, but the fact remains that the detail essential to his narrative is not stated but left to inference.

If a student, perplexed by these difficulties, betakes himself to the commentaries, he will find Briggs quoting a manuscript note by Walter Taylor, Professor of Greek at Cambridge, which interprets the date as *circa initium Septembris*; and he will find Cholmeley asserting that the date is the middle of September. Both, then, have judged Orion to be rising rather than setting (which, for the reasons given above, I think improbable), and Cholmeley's calculations are inaccurate.² Neither betrays surprise that any date should be fixed at this point; neither any perception that only a date and not an hour has been fixed. Briggs himself is more alert: *quod hic describitur*, he says, *si ad litteram interpreteris, semel tantum in quolibet anno fit: quapropter poetice non Astronomice haec dici existimandum est, et definiri solummodo tempus illud, 'cum medio volvuntur sidera lapsu'*. No other commentary shows any consciousness of a problem, or even that T. has provided a date.

What Briggs means in effect is that T. set out to tell us that the snakes arrived at midnight, fell to embroidering his phrase, and ended inadvertently by telling us instead that they arrived in February. T., as I have more than once had occasion to say before,³ is often surprisingly careless in detail, and this explanation does not seem to me incredible. Probable, however, I do not think it. We cannot guess how much astronomy his audience knew, and (since this poem cannot be dated) it may well be that Aratus had still to compile from Eudoxus the Gentleman's Guide to the Heavens which would brush the dust off their knowledge. Still, they were more star-conscious than most moderns,⁴ and though perhaps not many could have said offhand that the date fixed by T. was in February, not one can have been unaware that the midnight sky is not uniform in appearance throughout the year.

¹ Moreover, by the time Betelgeuse is visible a good part of the Bear will be 'rising' rather than 'setting'.

² He has calculated for Lat. 35° N., and his date is accurate for the present time but not for T.'s.

³ C.Q. xiii. 22, xxiv. 146, xxxii. 16; C.R.

lvi. 15 f.

⁴ It is hard, for example, to imagine Morning and Evening Stars heading and ending a Lord Mayor's show as they did Ptolemy's procession (Ath. 5. 197d). The symbolism there is simple but it is for the populace. T. writes for a cultivated audience.

That is all the help the student will derive from commentaries, but Legrand, who, though he has unfortunately never written a commentary, has scrutinized this poet more attentively than most who have, notices the major difficulty. *Inopinément*, he says, *et d'une façon assez déconcertante*, T. joint ici à l'indication d'heure une indication de saison, and he suggests that T. has taken his description from a picture.¹ He is aware that the scene is an interior, but though exterior windows play little part in Greek architecture and one which should command the heavens from Betelgeuse to the Bear is hardly to be thought of, this objection is perhaps not fatal, for in ancient frescoes daylight scenes (at any rate) are sometimes staged against a wall above which sky or architectural details may be seen.² But this explanation, though again I hesitate to call it impossible, does not seem to me probable, nor, if true, would it be very helpful. In the first place, T.'s main source in this poem is plainly Pindar's First Nemean Ode, which he is engaged in keying down from a heroic to a domestic level; and since it is incredible that any ancient painter should have treated the subject so, it is not easy to believe that he turned to paintings for inspiration. Secondly, though it does not seem very likely that an ancient painter would ornament a section of the night sky with recognizable constellations, he might have done so without risk, for the amateur requires the horizon, and amateur and professional alike require the time of night, before they can infer a date. But a poet who provides the hour, and by suppressing the painter's wall or window-sill tacitly substitutes the horizon, should be aware that he has imported a date into his narrative. Therefore I think that conscientious scholars, after noting the possibility that they may be mare's-nesting, must nevertheless take T. at his face value and address themselves to the question why he has staged this scene in February (or, if they prefer, about the end of August).

And since I have gone so far I will suggest two directions in which the answer may lie. First, it seems possible that some festival of Herakles was connected with his earliest exploit, or, since T. gives us his age at this time (l. 1), with his birth or his conception, and that T.'s date is derived from the date of the festival. The poem, as we now know from *p. Ant.*, once ended with a prayer for victory, and presumably therefore it was written for a competition on some specific festival occasion. As against this, however, no festival of the god is known to have been particularly associated with any of these events, and though ancient lore assigned his birth to the fourth day of the month,³ since nobody tells us of what month, I do not share Gruppe's confidence that this belief was derived from the date of a birth-festival.⁴

Another possibility is that the poem, though ostensibly devoted to Herakles, has a symbolic reference to contemporary history. That is not in itself improbable. The strangling of the snakes by the heroic infant is a suitable symbol for the triumph of any good cause, and in the preceding century the device had been widely used on coins to convey a political significance.⁵ In connexion with the Ptolemies, moreover, the symbol would have had a special appropriateness since that house traced its descent from Herakles.⁶ A writer, it is true, who should use Herakles as the symbol

¹ *Buc. Gr.* i. 169. Legrand overlooks the fact that the hour is not stated but must be inferred from the words. The date he fixes, mistakenly, *vers la fin de septembre*.

² e.g. Medea and her children (Herrmann, *Mal. d. All.* 130), Thetis and Hephaestus (ib. 141). Herakles and the snakes appear in ancient frescoes from Pompeii and Herculaneum. In one (ib. 41) the scene takes place, apparently by daylight, in front of a wall with a large open door in it; in another (ib. 83) in a room with a very small arched window. In a third fresco

(*Arch. Zeit.* xxvi, T. 4) there is a conventional architectural background.

³ Philochorus, *fr.* 177 (*F.H.G.* i. 413), and other authorities there cited.

⁴ *RE*, Suppl. iii. 1016. Apollo and Horkos were born on the 7th and 5th respectively (*Hes. W.D.* 771, 803); and the latter, at any rate, is unlikely to have had a birth-festival.

⁵ See Seltman, *Gr. Coins*, 157, pl. 32; Bury, *Hist. of Greece*, 553.

⁶ T. 17. 26; see *Satyr. fr.* 21. Pt. Euergetes in

of a He
therefor
In part
there is
the Ma
25th or
date Dr
probabl
that wh
he tells
is new-l
strangle
the poet

The
well wit
do noth
define, n

The
κοῖλα θυ
vocal. S
κοῖλα κλ
that the
that the
doorpost
κοῖλα; o
followed
müller ei
where the
the post
poetical
to Legra

a lost insc
himself ra

¹ He is
cf. 56, 59,
of Zeus, v
proceeding
Note also
in Thebes;
is mention
palliated b
that the m
vacates the
Eumolpos
110), which
of a Greek
however, ti
for in Alexi
lesson from

² Beloch
Service, xv
which I ow
It is true

of a Hellenistic prince must handle some aspects of his story with caution, and it is therefore worth remark that where the ground is dangerous T. in fact treads cautiously. In particular he hardly so much as hints that the hero is not his father's son.¹ And there is another matter which is worth remark. Ptolemy Philadelphus was born in the Macedonian month Dystros, and he was made joint-king with his father on the 25th or 26th of that month in the year 285 B.C.—probably on his birthday. At that date Dystros 25 fell in April, which month, therefore, contained certainly one and probably two important royal anniversaries.² In the first line of this poem T. tells us that when Herakles encountered the snakes he was ten months old. It is the first thing he tells us about his hero, and it is in conflict with other authorities, for in Pindar Herakles is new-born, and in Apollodorus (2. 4. 8) he is eight months old. As we have seen, he strangles his snakes in February and was therefore born in April—and here, provided the poem is connected with Philadelphus, is obviously the making of a pretty point.

The proviso, however, is important, for though the facts I have mentioned fit well with the hypothesis that the poem is connected with the Ptolemaic court, they do nothing to establish it; and I end as I began by saying that my purpose was to define, not to solve, the first problem presented by the lines I have quoted.³

The second problem posed by these lines is the meaning of the words *δοι σταθμὰ κοῖλα θυράων* in 15; and here the commentators though discordant are at least more vocal. Some content themselves with citing Soph. *O.T.* 1261 *ἐκ δὲ πυθμένων | ἔκλυε κοῖλα κλῆθρα* and discreetly refrain from interpreting either passage. Brandt⁴ thinks that the palace has a doorway void of doors; J. A. Hartung, Ameis, and Könnicke⁵ that the snakes enter by a hole left for the cat; Paley, followed by Hiller, that the doorposts are hollow and that the snakes live in them. Meineke proposed *καλά* for *κοῖλα*; others have been tempted by *οἶκου* at the beginning of the next line. Kreussler, followed by Fritzsche, wrote *οἶγεν* (*ubi postes faciebant aperturam forium*); Stadtmüller *εἶκεν*, which Cholmeley accepts and, on the basis of Soph. *O.T.* 1262, translates *where the posts gave way and bent inwards*;⁶ Platt⁷ *οἶξεν* with *Ἥρη* as subject—“opened the posts of the doors so as to make a hollow space”, *σταθμὰ θυράων* being only a poetical expansion of *θύρας*. Naturally none of these confections has proved palatable to Legrand, who translates *là où les montants des portes offraient des cavités*, adding in

a lost inscription (Ditt. *Or. Gr. Inscr.* 54. 4) called himself *τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ πατρὸς Ἡρακλέους τοῦ Διός*.

¹ He is *Ἀργεῖου κεκλημένος Ἀμφιτρίωνος* (104, cf. 56, 59, 121, 135) and is nowhere called the son of Zeus, who merely keeps an eye on Hera's proceedings (21) and provides illumination. Note also that the scene is nowhere located in Thebes; that though H.'s notorious appetite is mentioned (137) it is confined to supper and palliated by his abstemiousness during the day; that the most famous of his instructors, Linos, vacates the music stool in favour of the mysterious Eumolpos in order to teach him *γράμματα* (105, 110), which stand first in his curriculum as in that of a Greek gentleman (Plat. *Theag.* 122 E). I add, however, that this need not be T.'s invention, for in Alexis *fr.* 135 Herakles is having a reading lesson from Linos: cf. Zenob. 4. 45.

² Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* iv². 2, 170, 180; *Ann. d. Service*, xvii. 217; *Misraim*, vi. 31—references which I owe to the kindness of Dr. W. W. Tarn. It is true, but not, I think, material, that

Dystros 25 may at the time of his birth in 308 B.C. have fallen earlier in the year.

³ Mr. Edmonds (*Gr. Buc. Poets*, 287) remarked that ‘such a poem would doubtless be acceptable at the Alexandrian court in the early years of . . . Ptolemy III’, and so no doubt it might have been until the disgrace of his mother, Arsinoe I, which was apparently in 279 B.C. (*J. Egypt. Arch.* xxvi. 65). Pt. Euergetes was born on Dios 5, a year or two earlier than 280 B.C. (Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* iv². 2. 184), at which date Dios seems to have coincided roughly with October (*Arch. f. Papyrusf. Beiheft*, ii. 17—a reference which I owe to Dr. F. M. Heichelheim).

⁴ *Jahrb. Phil.* xxi. 607. ⁵ *Philol.* lxxii. 389.

⁶ I do not know where Stadtmüller made this proposal nor how he construed it. Cholmeley supposes the snakes to batter their way in—as though the posts would be the point to batter, and as though Alkmene would in those circumstances be waked only by the screams of Iphikles (34). ⁷ *J. Phil.* xxxiv. 145.

a footnote *Énigmatique. Pourtant tel doit être le sens*. I agree, it ought; for, though *σταθμός* has other meanings, in connexion with doors it means the door-posts—τὰ ἐκατέρωθεν ξύλα κατὰ πλευρὰν τῶν θυρῶν ἃ καὶ παραστάδας φασίν;¹ and if T. has been misunderstood he has only himself to thank. I have little doubt, however, that *σταθμὰ κοῖλα θυρῶν* is his elegant way of saying *θύραι κοιλόσταθοι*, or *θυρῶν κοιλόσταθμα*, and in this compound *σταθμός* seems to have another sense.

The words *κοιλόσταθος*, *κοιλοσταθεῖν* are now sufficiently attested in L. and S. Their meaning is far from clear, but they apparently denote panelled, or at least timbered, construction, and *σταθμὰ κοῖλα θυρῶν* may therefore mean merely *the panelled doors or the woodwork of the doors*.² Neither adjective nor verb belongs to the vocabulary of literature, and that is perhaps why T. has taken this liberty with one of them. He has, however, done much the same at 15. 112, where he writes *δρυνὸς ἄκρα* instead of *ἀκρόδρυν*, a more literary, though perhaps not a very poetical, word.³

It will be noticed that, unless *κοιλόσταθος* denotes some form of latticed or open-work construction,⁴ T.'s phrase has given us no precise information as to the means by which the snakes got past the doors. It is not essential that it should (as Meineke saw when he proposed *καλά*), and there is perhaps a reason why it should not. T.'s main source, as has already been said, is Pindar's First Nemean, but there the snakes' assault follows immediately upon the birth of the children, which is apparently in the day-time (35), and the snakes enter the house *οἰχθεῖσάν πυλῶν* (41). Pindar perhaps leaves the situation a little vague, and certainly he gives no hint to a poet who transposes the scene to midnight, when houses of the better class were, we may suppose, proof against such incursions. To explain the route taken by the intruders might well be tedious at this point in the narrative; to provide them with miraculous facilities might invite the inquiry what Zeus was doing to allow it.

And finally a word about l. 16, cursorily condemned by Paley as *ineptus versus*, and by Hiller on three grounds—(1) that the snakes have come to kill, not to eat the

¹ Poll. 1. 76.

² The expression *θυρίδες κοιλόσταθοι*, cited by L. and S. from *p. Petr.* 48. 18 occurs also in the Zenon papyri, Michigan, 38. 6, and probably Cairo 59764. 3 (where the noun is a restoration). The former twice attaches the adj. to *θύρωμα* also, and twice uses *κοιλόσταθμα* substantively in connexion with *θυρίδες*. Smyly and Edgar referred the words to the timber casing of door- and window-frames; and this sense would suit adequately *τὸν κοιλόσταθμον τοῦ ναοῦ* in a Delian inscription (*I.G.* xi. 2. 287, A. 96) which gives the price as rather more than half that of the doors supplied by the same craftsman, and it suits most of the references in the papyri. At a pinch also it would suit T., for we might suppose him to mention the wooden portion of the door-frame, leaving us to guess how it provided a passage for the snakes. It does not, however, fit *p. Mich.* 38. 20 *κοιλόσταθμα ἔσω κλειόμενα* (which suggests some form of shutters), nor the LXX passages, which are these: 3 K. 6. 9 *ἐκοιλοστάθησεν τὸν οἶκον κέδροις*, 15 (*τὸν οἶκον*) *ἐκοιλοστάθησεν* . . . *ξύλοις ἔσωθεν*, *Hg.* 1. 4 *ἐν οἴκοις ὑμῶν κοιλοστάθμοις*. Professor D. W. Thomas kindly tells me that in the first and third passages of LXX the Hebrew root is *sāphan*, in the second a derivative *sippūn*; and that the

primary meaning is *cover, cover in*. The reference in all cases he takes to be to the roof or ceiling. He tells me also that *sāphan* is rendered *φατνοῦν* at 3 K. 7. 3, and *ξύλοιν* at *Jer.* 22. 14.

The words *κοιλόσταθος*, *-εῖν* were perhaps short-lived. The three papyri, and the Delian inscription, are all of the third century B.C., and the LXX possibly as early (see Swete, *Introduction*, p. 25). Cyril of Alexandria in his gloss on Haggai (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxi. 1028 c) is visibly reduced to conjecture by the term (*ὡν ἂν . . . τῶν θυρῶν οἱ σταθοὶ σιδήρει διακοιλαινούντο περιουπτόντων οἰμαὶ που τεκτόνων αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς σφῶν ἐντεχνίας ἐγχαρᾶντόντων δαιδάματα*).

³ Since commentaries (and grammars) remain speechless before this remarkable phenomenon, I observe that Nicander (*fr.* 74. 55) writes *παιδὸς ἔρωτες* for the botanical word *παιδέρωτες*; but he, unlike T., is under metrical constraint. The peculiarity of these resolutions is that the meaning of the compound is not inherent in the components into which the poets resolve it.

⁴ Latticed doors and window-coverings are common enough (see Schütz, *Typus d. hellenistisch-ägypt. Hauses*, 63), and this explanation would be somewhat tempting but for the LXX passages, which are hard to reconcile with it.

child, (2) objection used by κανεῖν (92) 'Απειλεῖν and on the seems rather predicate are the pa and inde approach

And, informati I said tw did not e the snake Where an (54),⁵ an When th bed (60), sleeps by sleeping is diffuse her husb Don't yo there is so and his v plunged i only hear or recess are, after linguistic the whole that the where the as soon a other roo Depri

His shou snoring h

¹ Ap. R. ² I susp the word tion. That by ll. 53, 6. ³ The li φayeῖν), bu for so are 239) I do n

child, (2) that the use of ἀπειλεῖν is odd, and (3) that the word οἶκον is superfluous. The objection to φαγεῖν, though Platt made light of it, seems to me serious. The verbs used by Teiresias, who may be supposed well-informed, are διαδηλήσασθαι (85) and κανεῖν (92), and if the line is genuine a substitute should perhaps be looked for. Ἀπειλεῖν in the sense of *order menacingly*, supported on the one hand by Apollonius and on the other by St. Luke,¹ stands firm against attack, and the rarity of the use seems rather in favour of the line than against it. And if, as I think, κοῖλα is not predicate but attribute, and the meaning not *where the doorposts are hollow* but *where are the panelled (?) doors*, my feeling is that some such addition is almost required—and indeed it is in any case not amiss that we should hear what door the snakes approach.² I take T. to mean the main door of the house or palace.³

And, since I am writing on this poem, this is not the only door in it about which information would not be amiss; and I will take this opportunity of explaining why I said twelve years ago⁴ that T.'s setting puzzles me, and voiced a suspicion that he did not envisage it very clearly himself. After passing the door we have considered, the snakes reach the cradle without encountering any further recorded obstacle. Where are the children sleeping? Though ten months old (1) they are still ὑποτίθιοι (54),⁵ and, despite the τροφός in 31, apparently at their mother's breast (3). When the commotion has subsided Iphikles is seemingly taken into his mother's bed (60), and Herakles, when old enough to be promoted from cradle to lion-skin, sleeps by his father's side (135). One would suppose, therefore, that they were sleeping in their parents' room. On the arrival of the snakes a miraculous light is diffused ἀνὰ οἶκον and the cries of Iphikles awake Alkmena (34 ff.), who rouses her husband. 'Get up at once,' she says; 'can't you hear Iphikles screaming? Don't you see that, though it is dead of night, the walls are as clear as day? I'm sure there is something wrong, my dear.' As Amphitryon is hurriedly collecting his thoughts and his weapons the miraculous light is extinguished and the ἀμφιλαφής παστάς is plunged in darkness. Alkmena, it is plain, does not know what is the matter, and can only hear, not see, the children. Either, then, the parents are sleeping in some alcove or recess which does not command a view of the whole apartment, or the children are, after all, in another room. The former explanation can hardly be excluded on linguistic grounds, for παστάς, an obscure word, seems sometimes used to denote not the whole θάλαμος but some part of it;⁶ but I do not think it would occur to anybody that the ἀμφιλαφής παστάς was not the whole θάλαμος unless he was puzzled to know where the children were, and since the whole household seemingly arrives on the scene as soon as the parents (54 ff.) I think we must conclude that the children are in some other room.

Deprived of supernatural illumination Amphitryon calls for a light (48):

οἴσσετε πῦρ ὅτι θάσσον ἀπ' ἐσχαρεῶνος ἐλόντες,
δμῶες ἐμοί, στιβαροὺς δὲ θυρᾶν ἀνακόψατ' ὀχῆτας.

His shout is caught up by γυνὴ Φοίνισσα μύλαις ἐπὶ κοῖτον ἔχουσα⁷, who rouses the snoring household. What door, or doors, are they to unbar? The front door, according

¹ Ap. Rh. 3. 607, *Ad. Ap.* 4. 17.

² I suspect that some moderns may have felt the word to be unduly emphasized by its position. That T. would not have felt it so is shown by ll. 53, 63, 83, 97.

³ The line is present in *p. Ant.* (with the verb φαγεῖν), but that is not conclusive in its favour, for so are 86 f., and despite Wilamowitz (*Textg.* 239) I do not see how they can be defended.

⁴ *C.Q.* xxiv. 151.

⁵ Or, if you prefer the reading of codd., ἐπιτίθιοι.

⁶ The word is discussed by Jebb at *Soph. Ant.*, p. 264.

⁷ A direct descendant, no doubt, of the γυνὴ ἀλετρίς of *Od.* 20. 105 and perhaps related to the γυνὴ Φοίνισσα of *Od.* 15. 417.

to Wuestemann,¹ *ut advocari possint vicini*, though as yet Amphitryon does not even know what is the matter. His own bedroom door, according to Fritzsche,² though one would have thought that if this was locked he would open it himself from the inside.³ Moved by this consideration Blass,⁴ closing Amphitryon's speech at *δμῶες ἐμοί*, wrote *ἀνεκόψατ'*, and subsequent editors have accepted the emendation⁵ though Legrand thinks that the door is that separating the slaves' quarters from the rest of the house. Certainly the correction is plausible; and yet I doubt if it is true. T. is evidently thinking of *Od.* 21. 47 *θυρέων ἀνέκοπτεν ὄχῃας*, where Penelope fetches from the store-room the bow, which hangs in it, like Amphitryon's sword (43), on its peg. The verb there is active, not middle (and *ἀνέκοιψεν*, which Blass offered as an alternative, is less easy as a correction), and it is used of opening a door from the outside, not from within.⁶ I do not think we can get beyond guesswork here, but if guess we must I should suppose that Amphitryon is sounding an alert throughout the house, and that the doors are internal—all those which prevent free circulation, and particularly, as Legrand suggests, those behind which the slaves are confined; I should suppose further that the imperative *ἀνακόψατε* is correct, and that it is addressed to the world in general, or, if you like to be more precise, to the more trusted members of the household who are not locked up at night. We are very imperfectly informed about the housing of the domestic slaves in Greece, but in a household of any size there must have been one or more who exercised the kind of supervision which is entrusted to Eurykleia in the *Odyssey*.⁷ Still, when all is said and done, I can form no clear picture of Amphitryon's domestic arrangements. I do not know whether T. pictures his home as a Homeric or as a Hellenistic palace (or house), or even whether he pictures it at all. And in particular I cannot locate the night-nursery.

A. S. F. Gow.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ And so more recently Taccone (*Boll. Fil. Class.* xx. 231).

² Bursian, v. 31.

³ No doubt a *θάλαμος* could sometimes be locked from the inside in such a way that it could not be unlocked from without (see, for instance, Anacr., *fr.* 88; Soph., *O.T.* 1244), but if this was a matter of course I do not see why a Greek best man should be called *θυρωρός* and be detailed to lock the door and keep the bridesmaids off (Hesych. s.v., Poll. 3. 42). A *θάλαμος* in which Phoenix is confined is locked from the outside and he has to break down the door to escape (*Il.* 9. 475). Still, Amphitryon can hardly be shouting to be let out of his own bedroom.

⁴ *Rhein. Mus.* lxii. 268.

⁵ Wilamowitz inadvertently failed to adjust his punctuation accordingly.

⁶ So also *ἀνακρούειν* (Arat. 193).

⁷ Eurykleia, who shuts up the women at *Od.* 19. 16, 30, 21. 382, 387, is called *ραμῆ* (2. 345) and *γυναικῶν δμῶδων σκόπος* (22. 395). For the *ραμῆ* see Xen. *Econ.* 9. 11; for Euangelos, major-domo to Perikles, see Plut. *Per.* 16. The usual custom seems to have been to house female slaves in a *γυναικωνίτις* separated by bolted doors from the *ἀνδρωνίτις* (Xen. *Econ.* 9. 5), but the Phoenician slave here sleeps by her work, and Medea's handmaidens at Ap. Rh. 3. 838 in the *πρόδομος* of her *θάλαμος*.

I. 'F
exsulatu
opem ve
deinde p
dignusqu
(Livy, vi
what is
this sing
by Mom
Republic
because
has neve
princeps
military
portions
political
which in
religion,
temple t
do not c
disaster
Concord
first to r
been sug
probabili

¹ Mrs. M
Felix Jac
Weinstock
are not re
² Mom
xiii, 1878,
subject of
F. Muenze
L. De Bea
premiers
275; B. G.
R.G. iii. 2
aus der
Verhandel
Hirschfeld
Friedlande
Pais, St.
Sanctis, S
'Camillus
Cocchia, 'C
dell' incen
1922, 17. C
Katastroph
Antike Sch
röm. Gesch
The bes
in E. Bur

CAMILLUS AND CONCORD¹

I. 'Fuit enim vere vir unicus in omni fortuna, princeps pace belloque priusquam exsulatum iret, clarior in exsilio, vel desiderio civitatis quae capta absentis imploravit opem vel felicitate qua restitutus in patriam secum patriam ipsam restituit; par deinde per quinque et viginti annos—tot enim postea vixit—titulo tantae gloriae fuit dignusque habitus quem secundum a Romulo conditorem urbis Romanae ferrent' (Livy, vii. 1. 9). This is Livy's ideal Roman, in whom it is not difficult to distinguish what is typically Livian from what is generally Augustan. How Camillus acquired this singular dignity makes a long story, the general lines of which were established by Mommsen in an unsurpassed and unsurpassable essay.² We know how the Republican hero became a predecessor of the Augustan *princeps*—the more *princeps* because the more *civis*. But a point, which it would be venturesome to call irrelevant, has never been closely analysed nor satisfactorily explained. Camillus remains *princeps bello* in his own right for the victory over Veii, although, as is certain, his military leadership in the Gallic catastrophe must be reduced to very modest proportions, or to nothing. But *princeps pace*? With an unusual amount of agreement, political historians tend to discount the story of his part in the settlement of 367 B.C. which introduced the plebeian to the consulate; on the other hand, historians of religion, helped by archaeologists, stubbornly maintain that Camillus dedicated a temple to Concord in that very year 367 B.C.³ For the sake of Camillus—who was, I do not doubt, that statesman whom the rapid recovery of Rome after the Gallic disaster makes it necessary to presuppose—and even more for the sake of Roman Concord, the contradiction must be either solved or explained away. It is necessary first to recall briefly those elements of the Camillus legend which are likely to have been suggested by later events, in order to see whether any criteria of general probability may be established for the tradition of Camillus as conciliator (see II);

¹ Mrs. M. I. Henderson, Professors Hugh Last, Felix Jacoby, Eduard Fraenkel and Dr. St. Weinstock read and discussed this paper. They are not responsible for my conclusions.

² Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.* ii. 297 = *Hermes*, xiii, 1878, 515. The best introduction to the subject of Camillus is the admirable article by F. Muenzer in P.-W. vii, 1912, 329. Cf. especially L. De Beaufort, *Dissert. sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'hist. rom.*, Utrecht, 1738, 275; B. G. Niebuhr, *R.G.* ii³, 533 ff.; A. Schwegler, *R.G.* iii. 263, 279, etc.; P. Burger, 'Sechzig Jahre aus der älteren Geschichte Roms, 418–358', *Verhandel. Akad. Amsterdam*, xx, 1891; O. Hirschfeld, 'Zur Camillus-Legende', *Festschrift Friedländer*, 1895, 125 = *Kl. Schriften*, 273; E. Pais, *St. di Roma*, 1 ed., i. 2 *passim*; G. De Sanctis, *St. d. Romani*, ii. 214, 258; E. Täubler, 'Camillus und Sulla', *Klio*, xii, 1912, 219; E. Cocchia, 'Ispirazione popolare nella tradizione dell' incendio gallico', *R. Indo-Greco-Ital.* vi, 1922, 17. Cf. also F. Schachermeyr, 'Die gallische Katastrophe', *Klio*, xxiii, 1929, 277; J. Kromayer, *Antike Schlachtfelder*, iv, 447; F. Altheim, *Epoch. röm. Geschichte* I, 1934, 163.

The best recent analysis of Livy's Camillus in E. Burck, *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius*,

1934, 109. Cf. G. Funaioli, 'Camillo e i Galli in Tito Livio', *Studi Liviani*, 1934, 111–34; H. Bruckmann, *Die römischen Niederlagen im Geschichtswerk des T. Livius*, diss. Münster, 1936, 41; F. Hellmann, *Livius-Interpretationen*, 1939, 32, and also W. Aly, *Livius und Ennius*, 1936 (*Neue Wege zur Antike*, ii. 5), 11. On the hopeless problem of the sources of the life of Camillus by Plutarch (here called Plut.) a good orientation in W. Soltau, 'Die Quellen Plutarchs in der Biographie d. Valerius Poplicola', *Jahresb. Gymn. Zabern*, 1904–5, 19–21.

³ For instance, G. Wissowa, *Rel. u. Kultus d. Römer*², p. 328; J. G. Frazer, *Ovidii Fastorum libri sex*, ii, 1929, 238; C. Bailey, *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*, 1932, 136; F. Altheim, *A History of Roman Religion*, 1938, pp. 282 and 521, n. 43. Against the tradition, Pais, op. cit. i. 2, 139; W. Hoffmann, *Rom und die griech. Welt im 4. Jahrh.*, 1934, 90, and especially E. Skard, 'Euergetes-Concordia', *Avh. Norske Ak.*, 1932, 102: to Skard I am deeply indebted. Cf. also H. Jordan, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, i. 2, 1885, 336; O. Gilbert, *Gesch. u. Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, iii, 1890, 62; H. Strassburger, *Concordia ordinum*, 1931, 4; 125.

secondly, to examine the part of Camillus in 368–367 B.C. (III); thirdly, to check the data on the temple of Concord (IV); and last, to measure the importance of the settlement of 367 in the Greek-Roman history of Homonoia-Concordia (V).

II. The older portrait of Camillus, as far as we can guess it from Diodorus, is substantially free from political *Tendenz*. The victory over Veii is already presented under the Trojan dress (xiv. 93. 2), but the peace with the Falisci is apparently not yet connected with Camillus' magnanimity (xiv. 98. 5). On the exile, Diodorus follows a secondary source (xiv. 117. 6) which attributes it to the period after the Gallic war. I do not doubt that this chronology is due to some confusion,¹ and that the exile before 390 (387) B.C. is historical;² but what the usual source of Diodorus thought about it is irretrievably lost. We know, however, that Camillus was not yet the spectacular saviour of Rome after the Gallic catastrophe: he gets back the Roman gold in a later expedition (xiv. 117. 5)—something more than Polybius' distrustful silence,³ but much less than Livy's superb scene. It is equally remarkable that Pontius Cominius climbs the beleaguered Capitol not to obtain the approval of the Senate to Camillus' dictatorship but simply to give an indirect occasion for the miracle of the geese and the feat of Manlius (ch. 116). Dionysius follows the same version (xiii. 7). Camillus returns to the foreground in the ensuing war against the Volscans, the substantial authenticity of which seems very likely. He is certainly not yet connected with the repression of Manlius Capitolinus' revolutionary attempt. The few words of Diodorus in xv. 35. 3 (from a chronographer?)—*Μάρκος Μάνλιος ἐπιβαλόμενος τυραννίδι καὶ κρατηθεὶς ἀνιέρθη*—would not suffice for this conclusion, if the later annalists did not betray themselves by transferring Manlius' end to 384 B.C. from 385 (in which, characteristically, Livy, vi. 16, says that Manlius was arrested for the first time by the dictator A. Cornelius Cossus and afterwards released). Camillus was a tribune *consulari potestate* in 384 B.C., and the later annalists obviously found that a direct struggle between the two heroes was too good an opportunity.⁴ The source of Cassius Dio perfected the falsification by making Camillus dictator for the fourth time in 384 (fr. 25. 10 = Zonaras, vii. 24). Camillus' magnanimity towards Tusculum in 381 (analogous to that towards Falerii) is also absent in Diodorus; but his total silence about the Roman events of 367 B.C. again obscures a vital point.⁵

All that may be said is that the main source of Diodorus has nothing which can be proved or made likely to be later than the second Punic war. Camillus is chiefly a war-hero, but it would be rash to infer that no political action of his was known to the mysterious annalist on whom Diodorus most usually relies. All the other authors contain features which are likely to be later than the second Punic war. In particular, the following points seem to owe their origin to the period between the first Scipio and the Gracchi.

The sentiments of Camillus after the victory over Veii (Livy, v. 21. 14; Dionys. xii. 14, 16; Plut. *Camillus*, 5, 6; Zonar. vii. 21; Val. Max. i. 5. 2) are clearly analogous to, and probably imitated from, the sentiments of Scipio Aemilianus over Carthage.⁶

¹ Cf. O. Hirschfeld, op. cit.; J. Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.*, 1926, 117, believes that the item came to Diodorus from his chronographer: I cannot follow him.

² F. Muenzer, op. cit. 330.

³ Polyb. i. 6. 2; ii. 18. 2; 22. 4.

⁴ Cf. for instance, De Sanctis, ii. 196. J. M. Nap, *Die römische Republik um das Jahr 225 v. Chr.*, 1935, 156, 350 has, of course, much to say on all these events.

⁵ E. Schwartz, P.-W. s.v. 'Diodorus', col. 702; Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* III. It is obvious that the present discussion has nothing to do with the question of the date of the immediate source of Diodorus. But Beloch's theory that Diodorus' annalist is of the Sullan age did not persuade me (cf. F. Muenzer, *Gnomon*, 1927, 596; A. Klotz, *Rh. Mus.* lxxvi, 1937, 206).

⁶ Muenzer, P.-W. vii. 327. Cf. also E. Sh. Duckett, *Studies in Ennius*, Bryn Mawr, 1915, 44.

The trial
the proce
example
of the del
Diodorus
used in th
ought no
v. 46, tha
explain if
about cor
Cunctator
conflict b
Plut. 37–8
however,
butes to
auro recu
Ennius m

We co
historical,
it is, ther
is also no
Camillus'
ship rei p
Camillus
xiv. 117. 6
Plut. 7; A
the episod
incredible

I left a
the city,
have been
century B
saviour of
because A
L. Furius
fact. A di

This s
post-Grac
features o
impossible
and not 'v
liberty wi
falsifying

¹ Momms
Schriften, 28
v. 32. 8; Dio
Dio, fr. 24.

² That an
by E. Täub
tion of Livy

³ Schweg
Dio, xliii. 14

The trial which led to Camillus' voluntary exile offers analogies to the tradition of the process of the Scipiones.¹ The generosity of Camillus to Falerii was a stock example for Roman orators and historians, as shown by Livy, xlii. 47. 6, in his report of the debate of the Senate in 171 B.C. which seems to derive from a source common to Diodorus, xxx. 7. 1. We cannot conclude, of course, that the argument was really used in the Senate in 171 B.C., but the topic, strongly redolent of Scipionic *humanitas*, ought not to be either much earlier or much later. The confused tradition in Livy v. 46, that Camillus in 390 was appointed dictator by the army in Veii is easier to explain if influenced by the case of 217 B.C.:² that Dionys. xiii. 6 is not so fastidious about constitutional niceties does not mean much. The rivalry between Q. Fabius Cunctator and M. Minucius in the second Punic war is obviously the model of the conflict between Camillus 'Cunctator' and L. Furius Medullinus (Livy, vi. 22. 6; 25. 4; Plut. 37-8). Ennius may have much to do with some of these points. I am not certain, however, whether Muenzer is right in suggesting that, if Ennius (*ann.* vi. 196) attributes to Pyrrhus 'ferro, non auro, vitam cernamus utrique', Camillus' 'ferro non auro recuperare patriam' (Livy, v. 49. 3; cf. Plut. 29; Zon. vii. 23) is later than Ennius, Ennius may make Pyrrhus allude to a phrase which was already famous.

We come to the post-Gracchan elements. The *putsch* of Manlius is, of course, historical, but the presentation of it in our sources is almost certainly post-Gracchan: it is, therefore, natural to suggest that the association of Camillus with the affair is also not earlier. Täubler, furthermore, made it clear that the prolongation of Camillus' dictatorship after the Gallic catastrophe has the quality of Sulla's dictatorship *rei publicae constituendae causa*. I admit also that the extravagant version that Camillus was forced into exile because he used white horses for his triumph (Diod. xiv. 117. 6 from a secondary source; Dio, lii. 13. 3; *de vir. ill.* 23. 4; cf. Livy, v. 23; Plut. 7; App. *Ital.* 8) may have been invented by some enemy of Caesar's;³ but that the episode of Livy vi. 8 1 is imitated from Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* iv. 25. 3 seems to me incredible.⁴

I left aside the legend that in 390 B.C. Camillus reached Rome just in time to save the city, because I agree with those who consider it a popular tradition which may have been created in the fourth century B.C. Greek legends of the Gauls of the third century B.C. are almost contemporary with the facts. Aristotle knew of a Lucius saviour of Rome, whom it is not easy to identify with Manlius (as E. Meyer suggested), because Aristotle seems to presuppose that the Romans had already surrendered. L. Furius Camillus, of whom Niebuhr thought, may explain the name, but not the fact. A distorted report of the Camillus-legend is still the best solution.⁵

This survey supports our expectation of some considerable intervention of the post-Gracchan annalists for the events of 368-367 B.C., but also reminds us of two features of our evidence. The break in Diodorus' tradition just in 367 B.C. makes it impossible to compare pre-Gracchan and post-Gracchan tradition (I say 'tradition' and not 'writers') on the decisive point. The post-Gracchan elaboration used much liberty with everything concerning Camillus, but so far has not been convicted of falsifying the Fasti which concern him, except in the isolated instance of Cassius Dio,

¹ Mommsen, *op. cit.* ii. 498; Hirschfeld, *Kl. Schriften*, 282; cf. Livy, xxxviii. 60. 9 with Livy, v. 32. 8; Dionys. xiii. 5; Appian, *Ital.* 8; Plut. 12; Dio, fr. 24. 6.

² That and no more seems to have been proved by E. Täubler, *op. cit.*, 222. On the interpretation of Livy, Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. 1, 41.

³ Schwegler, iii. 228. 1; Hirschfeld, 278. Cf. Dio, xliii. 14. 3.

⁴ Muenzer, P.-W. vii. 341. One may recall that in the 'Somnium Scipionis' (*Rep.* vi. 12) Scipio Aemilianus is told 'dictator rem publicam constituas oportebit'.

⁵ Plut. 22 'Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος τὸ μὲν ἀλῶναι τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ Κελτῶν ἀκριβῶς δηλὸς ἐστίν ἀκηκοώς, τὸν δὲ σώσαντα Λεύκιον εἶναι φησιν. Cf. E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Allert.* v. 819.

who, against the other evidence, makes Camillus dictator for the fourth time in 384 B.C. The dictatorship after the Gallic catastrophe has been wrongly interpreted, but not invented.

III. The *fasti Capitolini* (CIL. i.² 20) and the annalistic tradition, as reflected in Livy, vi. 38 ff., Plut. 39 (and implicitly in Zonar. vii. 24, and Appian, *Gall.* i. 1), say that Camillus was a dictator in 368 and in 367 B.C., being compelled to abdicate in 368, when he was replaced by a dictator P. Manlius Capitolinus with the first Plebeian *magister equitum*. Suspicion is thrown upon the tradition by some of its elements. In 367 Camillus is said to have fought the Gauls, while Polybius (ii. 18. 6) knew that no Gallic war happened in the thirty years after the great disaster. Again, Livy and Zonaras attribute to this war the feat of T. Manlius Torquatus for which Livy himself was aware of an alternative date.¹

Yet, whatever we may think of our sources, one fact is clear. The dictatorial Fasti of the years 368–367 B.C. cannot have been invented; they tell too subtle a story. The annalistic version is obviously an interpretation of the Fasti, not the Fasti a summary of the annalists. And the interpretation is substantially correct. If a plebeian consul appears first in 366, Camillus, who in 368 had been replaced by another dictator more favourable to the plebs, must have changed his mind in 367; he accepted a solution that he had wanted to avoid a year earlier. On the other hand, the fact that the annalists are correct in their interpretation of the Fasti confirms the suspicion that they were helped by some further recollection. Events as prominent as those of 368–367 must have left behind some authentic oral tradition. The Licinian-Sextian Laws may here be left aside, but that modern criticism has not yet succeeded in proving their falsity is some additional guarantee to the pattern of tradition.² It is superfluous, then, to add the often-repeated observation that the agreement of 367 must have been preceded by much agitation and many irregularities, more or less as represented by our sources.³

The war with the Gauls, ruled out by Polybius, is probably false in the annalistic tale of 367. Nobody has yet found a chronological system good enough to reconcile Polybius' precise statement with the tradition of a Gallic incursion in 367. But it is understandable that people wanted to have Camillus' career concluded by a new war with the Gauls. The only serious obstacle to this view may be found in Zonaras, who connects the dictatorship of 367 with the Gallic expedition, but not with the Licinian-Sextian laws. I do not know whether Zonaras' version is a careless abbreviation by the writer himself or represents a branch of the annalistic tradition. In the second case, I would call it an attempt to simplify the position of Camillus. The dictatorship of Camillus was undeniable; the victory over the Gauls, once invented, was too good to be doubted, but the part of Camillus in the conciliation of 367 was in contradiction with the events of 368 and could be skipped over more easily. At its best, Zonaras represents a mistaken interpretation of the Fasti.

A glance at Livy can help us to understand Zonaras, because Livy himself is obviously uneasy as to the part of Camillus in the events of 367. One has the impression that Plutarch, too, shares this sentiment, which must have been common to the annalistic tradition at large, and therefore is a further guarantee that the apparent contradiction in Camillus' conduct between 368 and 367 B.C. was already a problem

¹ Cf. also F. Muenzer, *Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*, 1920, 8; J. Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* 341; H. Stuart Jones, *CAH.* vii. 526; E. Kornemann, *Röm. Gesch.* i, 1938, 126.

² Cf. especially G. Cardinali, *Studi Gracciani*, 1912, 129; H. Last, *CAH.* vii. 539; T. Frank, *An Economic Survey*, i, 1933, 26.

³ The *ludi votivi* of 358 B.C. 'quos M. Furius dictator voverat' (Livy. vii. 15. 12) may even be an authentic piece of news. Täubler's identification (p. 229) with the *ludi Capitolini* of Livy, v. 50. 4 (after the Gallic catastrophe) is not very probable.

for the an
source of I
to Concor
additional
part in th
little atten
is more th
10). Being
moment is
Veii. In th
captam co
concordia
truly Aug

IV. T
Vulcani b
19 to whic
dedicated
his soldier
86). Thir
Capitoline
Civ. i. 26. 1
be assume
evidence,
and dedica

Now, t
367 B.C. (C
the temple

- (1) Liv
- (2) Th
- an
- Op
- (3) Th

¹ The sto
abandoned
by Sullan a
but was ob
spread abou
tions which
by contemp
Vita Caes. 20
cf. Verg. *A*
with Th. M
173 (cf. M
359), and W
Cf. F. E. A
pino, *Points*
n. 1; R. Sym
1938, 2, n. 6
Ans., 1904, 5
tion to this

² Ovid, *F*
lvi. 25; Suet

for the annalists. Moreover, the ultimate source of Zonaras (as well as the ultimate source of Livy) probably did not know or did not believe that Camillus built a temple to Concord (see below). The omission, especially if intentional, may have been an additional reason for glossing over (or for toning down, as Livy prefers) Camillus' part in the class conflict of 367. But Livy had another reason of his own for giving little attention to the contribution of Camillus to the *concordia ordinum*. His Camillus is more than a conciliator of the orders: that was the role of Agrippa Menenius (ii. 33. 10). Being the second Romulus, the predecessor of Augustus, Camillus' culminating moment is the speech by which he dissuades the Romans from abandoning Rome for Veii. In the same spirit the elogium of Camillus in the Forum says 'Veios post urbem captam commigrari passus non est' (Dessau, *ILS.* 52 = Degrassi, *Elogia*, 61). The *concordia ordinum* had become a secondary achievement in comparison with the truly Augustan feat of having again given Rome to the gods and the gods to Rome.¹

IV. The dedication of a shrine (*aedicula*) of Concord in *Graecostasi* and in *area Vulcani* by Cn. Flavius in 304 B.C. is most surely documented by Pliny, *N.H.* xxxiii. 19 to which Livy, ix. 46, must be added. A temple of Concord in *arce* was, later, dedicated on 5 February 216 B.C. by L. Manlius, after he had quelled a mutiny among his soldiers (Livy, xxii. 33. 7; *CIL.* i², p. 233, 309; *Fasti Antiates* in *N.d. Scavi*, 1921, 86). Thirdly, a temple to Concord was dedicated between the Volcanal and the Capitoline Hill by L. Opimius in 121 B.C. after the death of C. Gracchus (App. *Bell. Civ.* i. 26. 120; Plut. *C. Gracch.* 17; Cic. *Pro Sest.* 140; August. *civ. Dei*, iii. 25). It must be assumed for archaeological reasons, although it is never stated in our literary evidence, that this is the temple which Tiberius rebuilt as an *aedes Concordiae Augustae* and dedicated on 16 January A.D. 10.²

Now, two sources add another temple and attribute it to Camillus' activity in 367 B.C. (Ovid, *Fasti*, i. 641-4, and Plut. 42). Ovid seems to assume that this was the temple rebuilt by Tiberius.³ The following facts must, however, be remarked:

- (1) Livy does not know of Camillus' temple (neither does Zonaras).
- (2) That the temple of Opimius was a simple rebuilding of Camillus' temple is an entirely modern conception. The sources which speak of the temple of Opimius know nothing of the temple of Camillus.
- (3) The story that in 211 B.C. a statue of Victory on the roof of the temple of

¹ The story that Rome might have been abandoned in Camillus' time was already told by Sullan annalists (Muenzer, *P.-W.* vii. 338), but was obviously reinforced by the rumours spread about Caesar's (and Augustus') intentions which were, no doubt, taken very seriously by contemporaries (Suet. *Caes.* 79; Nicol. *Dam. Vita Caes.* 20 = *FGH.* 90 F. 130; Hor. *Od.* iii. 3; cf. Verg. *Aen.* xii. 826). I substantially agree with Th. Mommsen, *Reden u. Aufsätze*, 1905, 173 (cf. Mommsen-Wilamowitz, *Briefwechsel* 359), and W. Warde Fowler, *Rom. Ess.* 1920, 216. Cf. F. E. Adcock, *CAH.* ix. 738, and J. Carcopino, *Points de vue sur l'imp. rom.*, 1934, p. 159, n. 1; R. Syme, *Papers Brit. School Rome*, xiv, 1938, 2, n. 6 and also R. Reitzenstein, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1904, 957. Professor Last called my attention to this point.

² Ovid, *Fasti*, i. 641; Cassius Dio, iv. 8. 2, lvi. 25; Suet. *Tib.* 20; *Fasti Praen.* in *CIL.* i²,

p. 231; *N.d. Scavi*, 1923, 196; *BMC. Coins Rom.* *Emp.* i. 137, n. 116; 139, n. 132. For the archaeological evidence, H. F. Rebert and H. Marceau, 'The Temple of Concord in the Roman Forum', *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome*, v, 1925, 53. Cf. also for older buildings of the area O. Richter, *Beiträge z. röm. Topographie*, iv, Berlin, 1910, 16-17; Viedebantt, *P.-W. Suppl.* iv, s.v. 'Forum Romanum', 494-5. In general Platner-Ashby, *Top. Diction. of ancient Rome*, s.v. 'Concordia, Aedes, Templum', and cf. also W. W. Tarn, *Proceed. Brit. Ac.* xix, 1933, 133.

³ Ovid, *Fasti*, i. 641:

Furius antiquam populi superator Etrusci
voverat et voti solverat ille fidem.
causa, quod a patribus sumptis secesserat armis
volgus, et ipsa suas Roma timebat opes.

Plut. 42 ἐξηφίσαντο τῆς μὲν Ὀμονοίας ἱερὸν, ὥσπερ
ἠῆξαιτο Κάμилλος, εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν
ἀποπτον ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἰδρῶσθαι, ταῖς δὲ

Concord was struck by lightning (Livy, xxvi. 23. 4) may be better referred to the temple *in arce* of 216. In fact Livy does not seem to presuppose the existence of two temples: 'in aede Concordiae Victoria quae in culmine erat fulmine icta'.

- (4) An *area Vulcani et Concordiae* is named in connexion with the *prodigia* of 181 B.C. (Livy, xl. 19. 2; cf. xxxix. 56. 6). As the *aedicula* of Cn. Flavius was erected *in area Vulcani*, it seems natural to infer that this *aedicula*, not the temple of Camillus, gave the name to the area.¹
- (5) If Ovid says that the temple of Tiberius was the temple of Camillus, he (or better his source, ultimately common to Plutarch) *may* be attributing to Camillus the temple of Opimius.

The conclusion is, therefore, that the temple of Camillus has not left any well-established trace in our literary tradition, except in the two passages of Plutarch and Ovid, which *may* attribute to Camillus the temple of Opimius. Clearly the literary evidence is weak, but it is generally assumed that archaeology and epigraphy support it strongly. No doubt the best argument is given by archaeologists and must be reproduced in full: 'Now it is especially significant that the caementa found in the concrete of the second temple [= Opimius' temple] are for the most part supplied by two kinds of Etruscan tufa, the yellow Grotta Oscura stone and the scoriated Fidenae stone, since it was Camillus, "populi superator Etrusci", who built the first temple and further, since the date of this temple, while a suitable one for both these materials, represents, so far as we know, the latest possible limit for the use of Fidenae stone in buildings at Rome. We are in consequence driven to believe that the first temple of Concord was constructed, in part, out of Fidenae and Grotta Oscura tufa, and that in 121 B.C. this once-hallowed material was broken up and scrupulously embodied in the structure of the later temple. The unique character of the Opimian concrete could scarcely be accounted for in any other way than as due to the use of stone from the earlier monument.'² This is a very acute observation, but proves only that earlier material was utilized in the concrete of Opimius. Whether that earlier material came from a former temple of Concord is a different matter. The fact remains that no structural element of a temple earlier than that of Opimius has been found *in situ*. G. Lugli, for this very reason, concluded that Camillus' temple must have been made of wood!³ To my mind, the archaeological argument is indeed of some support to the literary texts, but is far from being decisive. Not the archaeological evidence itself, but an entirely conjectural interpretation of the evidence lends assistance to the literary texts on Camillus' temple.

To the epigraphical argument, on the other hand, I would attribute no value. The *Fasti Pinciani*, preserved only in a copy, have at 22 July *Ludi Concor* followed by some mysterious letters, which O. Hirschfeld proposed to interpret *militum* and

καλουμένας Λαρίνας μίαν ἡμέραν προσθέρτας ἐοράξεν τέτραπας (on this last point cf. Samter, P.-W., s.v. 'Feriae Latinae', col. 2214).

¹ On the *aedicula* of Flavius, G. De Sanctis, *Riv. Fil. Class.* 55, 1927, 376 *contra* Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* 42. On the temple of 216 B.C. cf. also Chr. Hülsen, *Diss. Pont. Accad. Arch.* ii. 15, 1921, 331. It is, of course, a consequence of my argument that I must take the temple of Concord, in which the Senate deliberated the S.C. of Joseph., *Ant. Iud.* xiv. 145, as that on the Capitol, because I date this S.C. about 141 B.C. (*Ann. Scuola Norm. Pisa*, ii s., vol. iii, 1934, 214). For other opinions cf. Mommsen, *Hermes*, ix, 1875, 281 = *Ges.*

Schriften, iv. 145, and E. Bickermann, *Gnomon*, 1930, 357; id. *Der Gott der Makkabäer*, 1937, 145 (who prefers the date 105 B.C.). But the point is not relevant here.

² Rebert and Marceau, op. cit. (5, n. 2), p. 56. Cf. T. Frank, *Roman Buildings of the Republic*, 1924, 47. Among the older studies cf. A. Van Buren, *Class. Rev.* xx, 1906, 82; 184.

³ *Monumenti antichi di Roma e suburbio I La zona archeologica*³, 1931, 100: 'il tempio originale essendo stato in legno con rivestimento fittile, secondo l'uso italico' (cf. Engl. transl. 1929, p. 85). Cf. also E. De Ruggiero, *Il Foro romano*, 1913, 170.

to refer to proved or 1921, 103) CONCOR and by G bold. The there is a dedication

The fir tive litera argument of the tem a new one temple ign of Flavius Furthermo important ccciii anni already be any sense

A faint admitted, ment that is especial old hero to measured speak loud

V. Cn. posed that of Concord Homonoia Homonoia Metapontu impossible into Rome.

Yet, ev infer that notion of H of Agrippa a very com deed, expre

¹ G. Wissor

² Viedeban Romanum', 4

³ The altar by the comp Hell. vii. 4. Schwyzer, *Die Klio*, xiv, 1913 Head, *Hist. goddess Hom Wilamowitz,*

to refer to the peace of Misenum of 39 B.C. (*CIL*. i². 219). The theory has been disproved or at least made unlikely by the pre-Caesarian *Fasti Antiates* (*N. d. Scavi*, 1921, 103) which contain . . .]DIAE at the date 22 July, clearly to be restored CONCORDIAE.¹ Yet the inference by the editor of the *Fasti Antiates* G. Mancini and by G. Wissowa that the note alludes to the dedication of Camillus' temple is bold. The dates of the dedications by Opimius and by Cn. Flavius being unknown, there is ample ground to suspect that 22 July may be the date of one of these dedications.

The final balance is that the temple of Camillus is unknown to the most authoritative literary tradition and is weakly supported by archaeological discovery. The argument *e silentio* is here especially relevant because those who admit the existence of the temple of Camillus must conclude that Opimius replaced the old temple by a new one. It is legitimate to wonder why, then, the evidence which tells of Camillus' temple ignores Opimius and vice versa. The suggested alternative that the *aedicula* of Flavius was vowed by Camillus is clearly a vain attempt to escape this difficulty.² Furthermore, Cn. Flavius was conscious of doing something unusual and ideally important in dedicating his *aedicula*: 'inciditque in tabella aerea factam aedem ccciii annis post Capitolinam dedicatam' (Pliny, l.c.). If a big temple to Concord had already been in existence for about sixty years, Flavius must have been lacking in any sense of humour.

A faint possibility that Camillus did in fact build a temple to Concord must be admitted, but no more. Only the dictatorial *Fasti*, in my opinion, are a solid argument that Camillus took some part in the settlement of 367 B.C., and their evidence is especially valuable because it still allows us to perceive the slow conversion of the old hero to the necessity of the new Constitution. Niebuhr first and perhaps alone measured the immense importance of that year 367. If the goddess Concord did not speak loudly to Camillus, she was silently working with him.

V. Cn. Flavius, by dedicating his *aedicula* in *Graecostasi*, seems to have presupposed that the cult of Concord was not only new, but of Greek origin. In fact the cult of Concord appears in Rome just in that fourth century B.C. in which the cult of Homonoia was taking shape both in Greece and Magna Graecia. The altar to Homonoia of Olympia was probably dedicated about 363 B.C., and the coins of Metapontum with (the Goddess) Concord are dated between 400 and 350 B.C.³ It is impossible to escape the impression that Flavius was introducing a new Greek cult into Rome.

Yet, even if we conclude that Camillus' temple is a myth, it would be wrong to infer that Flavius' *aedicula* is the earliest evidence for the penetration of the Greek notion of Homonoia among the Romans. There is at least a chance that the apologue of Agrippa Menenius may represent an earlier stage of this influence.⁴ W. Nestle, in a very competent paper, made its Greek origin almost certain.⁵ The apologue, indeed, expresses the 'organic' conception of *δμόνοια* which was current in the fifth and

¹ G. Wissowa, *Hermes*, lviii, 1923, 387.

² Viedebant, P.-W. Suppl. iv, s.v. 'Forum Romanum', 492.

³ The altar of Olympia: Paus. v. 14. 9 dated by the comparison with Paus. v. 24. 4; Xen. *Hell.* vii. 4. 35; *Inscr. v. Olympia*, 260 = Schwyzer, *Dial. gr. ex. epigr.* 423 (cf. L. Weniger, *Klio*, xiv, 1915, 421). Homonoia of Metapontum: Head, *Hist. Num.*³, p. 77. The evidence on goddess Homonoia in P.-W. s.v. (Zwicker). Cf. Wilamowitz, *D. Glaube d. Hell.* ii. 308, n. 1 and

Hermes xxvi, 1891, 215 = *Kl. Schr.* v. 1. 50. In general M. Mühl, *Die antike Menschheitsidee*, 1928, 17 ff.

⁴ Livy, ii. 32; Dionysius, vi. 86; Zonaras, vii. 14. The Aesopic fable 197 Halm is the best analogy known to me, but 1 Corinth. xii. 12-27 is the striking translation into Christian terms.

⁵ *Klio*, xxvii, 1927, 350. Cf. also Skard quoted p. 111, n. 3, and W. Jaeger, 'Tyrtaios', *Sitz. Berl. Ak.*, 1932, 566.

fourth centuries B.C.¹ Nestle, however, went out of his way to conjecture that the fable was introduced into Roman history only in the late first century B.C. by the annalist Q. Aelius Tubero.² His argument is too weak to need detailed discussion. Dionysius says that the apologue *φέρεται ἐν ἀπάσαις ταῖς ἀρχαίαις ἱστορίαις* (vi. 83. 2), and his statement, important in itself, can be supported by serious considerations. The analysis of the tradition, as made by E. Meyer,³ proves not that Menenius was unknown before the Caesarean age, but that the annalists of the first century B.C. tried to replace him by an illustrious Valerius. Agrippa Menenius' family does not appear again in the Fasti after 366 B.C. Obviously Valerius Antias is not unconnected with this manœuvre, by which Cicero was deceived.⁴ Not without difficulty, as a glance at Dionysius shows (and *contra* recent annalists Dionysius may be polemical), the Augustan historians once more gave Menenius his due. It seems, therefore, natural to think that the apologue was attributed to Menenius when his name was still famous and his (authentic) action in a conflict with the plebeians was still remembered. We have, thus, to choose whether to remain contented with the early annalists or to decide on the fourth century B.C. I think that we must prefer the second alternative for two reasons, whose strength is cumulative. The family of the Menenii lost importance after the early fourth century B.C. The apologue itself best suits the historical situation before 366 B.C. because it teaches the plebeians subordination to the patricians. After the settlement of 367 (or at least its regular enforcement some years later), the whole story lost topical importance. Of course, it is possible to object that the fable may have been imported from Greece for its own sake at any time, but the coincidence of the *terminus ante quem* for the Menenii with the natural *terminus ante quem* for the apologue, if meant to be effective, gives a strong support to the view we prefer. To put it in a pointed form, there is a chance that Camillus already knew Menenius' apologue and learnt from it an aristocratic idea of Concord, which he had to repudiate in 367, when he opened the way to the plebeian (or patricio-plebeian) Concord of the plebeian champion Flavius.

Whatever the details, the conclusions are twofold. The notion of Homonoia became known to the Romans in the fourth century B.C., but the settlement of 367, whether or not already influenced by Greek thought, represents a peculiar Roman solution—the *concordia ordinum*.⁵ It is, of course, dangerous to simplify and say that the concord of Agrippa Menenius represents the Greek Homonoia and the concord of 367 the first stage of a specific Roman development. Yet I think that there is much in the point.

Greek (as opposed to Hellenistic) political Homonoia is a sentiment of friendliness

¹ The classic definition of the organic theory is, of course, Aristotle, *Polit.* A 2, 1253^a18 καὶ πρότερον δὲ τῇ φύσει πόλις ἢ οἰκία καὶ ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἐστιν. τὸ γὰρ ὅλον πρότερον ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τοῦ μέρους· ἀναιρουμένου γὰρ τοῦ ὅλου οὐκ ἔσται ποῦς οὐδὲ χεῖρ, εἰ μὴ ὁμονύμως. The idea of a *πόλις* of a polis runs through the whole of the fifth century: cf. for instance, Aesch. *Ag.* 848; Soph. *Ant.* 1015; Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 411; Herod. v. 28. The text of St. Paul quoted p. 117, n. 4 presupposes analogous sources.

² Skard, *Euergetes-Concordia*, cit. 90 ff., reached conclusions analogous to those of Nestle without knowing Nestle's paper, but his demonstration is less full: I discuss therefore Nestle. Mommsen said that Menenius' fable is 'so alt wie die römische Chronik überhaupt' (*Röm. Forsch.* ii. 128, n. 34) and was followed by E. Meyer, *Kl.*

Schriften, i. 358; G. De Sanctis, *St. d. Rom.* ii. 4, and F. Muenzer, P.-W. s.v. 'Menenius', col. 842 (who already knew Nestle's paper).

³ *Kl. Schriften*, i. 358.

⁴ *Brut.* 14. 54 'M. Valerium dictatorem dicendo sedavisse discordias eique ob eam rem honores amplissimos habitos et eum primum ob eam ipsam causam Maximum esse appellatum'.

⁵ H. Strassburger, *Concordia ordinum*, diss. Frankfurt, 1931, a first-class contribution to the study of Cicero, does not really go into the origin of the conception. The other study of great importance by Skard, cit. (to which I wish to acknowledge again my debt), does not see the problem which we try to formulate in the following pages. My present formulation owes something to a discussion with Mrs. M. I. Henderson.

among citi
three follow
Nomos or
among peo
The three
element is
tends to co
the extensio
patricians
the plebeia
Knights wi
on parallel
relevant in
possible the

Howeve
admit that
the static d

¹ A history
but, as usual,
Friedensgedan
portance. Mu
by H. Kram
græcis, diss. G
φίλος und *φι*
diss. München
cracy, Thucy
evidence on th
(Arist. *A.II*.
Lysias, xxv.
words of [L
πάντων *ἐλευθε*
J. Walz, *Ph*
P. Treves, R
Spartan hom
oracle in Dio
243, etc. On I
Mem. iv. 4. 16
of the *Republ*
relation of 'd
crates' concep
through the s
have been alre
course the who
iii. 82-4, is ro
Hellenistic-Ro
letter; Dio C
Arist. *orat.* 24
22, 23 (Mign
Stobaeum, ii.
although the s
thought has be
idea of Homon
Proc. Brit. Ac
1939, 62) is not
developments.

² On the hi
constitution of

among citizens of one or more cities made possible, broadly speaking, by one of the three following means: agreement on and subordination to either an impersonal Nomos or a personal Hegemon;¹ reciprocal check in a mixed constitution;² help among people of a different social condition, and chiefly help by the rich to the poor.³ The three forms are founded upon the idea of an organic structure in which each element is the condition of the normal life of the other elements. As such, Homonoia tends to *conserve* a pre-existing equilibrium. The Roman *praxis* of Concord emphasizes the *extension* of privileges from one class to another. The *concordia ordinum* between patricians and plebeians means that the patricians will share the magistracies with the plebeians: the *concordia ordinum* between Senators and Knights implies that the Knights will work with the Senators in the same institutions (law-courts) or at least on parallel lines. Subordination or reciprocal check or reciprocal help are much less relevant in this complex. The dominant note is that extension of rights which made possible the peculiar development of Roman citizenship.

However, if we pass from the *praxis* to the description of that *praxis*, we must admit that the Roman notion of Concord is almost entirely under the influence of the static *homonoia*.⁴ To quote only two typical instances from Livy, Concord is not

¹ A history of the idea of *homonoia* is wanted, but, as usual, H. Fuchs, *Augustin und d. antike Friedensgedanke*, 1926, 96 ff. is of capital importance. Much evidence is collected with care by H. Kramer, *Quid valeat homonoia in litteris graecis*, diss. Göttingen, 1915. Cf. also F. Dirlmeier, *philos und philia im vorhellenist. Griechentum*, diss. München, 1931. On homonoia and democracy, Thucyd. viii. 75. 2; 93. 3, and the whole evidence on the democratic restoration of Athens (Arist. A.II. 40. 3; Andoc. de myst. 76, 106; Lysias, xxv. 41, etc.). Cf. also the beautiful words of [Lysias] Epit. ii. 18 ἡγουμένοι τὴν πάντων ἐλευθερίαν ὁμόνοιαν εἶναι μερίστην (cf. J. Walz, *Philologus*, Suppl. 19. 4, 1936, and P. Treves, *Riv. Fil.* lxxv, 1937, 278). On the Spartan homonoia, the so-called Lycurgus' oracle in Diod. vii. 12. 2; Isocr. Panath. 234, 243, etc. On homonoia and law in general, Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 16. The Cleitophon and the 1st Book of the Republic, as is well known, discuss the relation of 'dikaiosyne' and 'homonoia'. Isocrates' conception of a homonoia among Greeks through the subordination to a 'hegemon' may have been already in Gorgias (fr. 8 a Diels). Of course the whole theory of *stasis* in Thucydides, iii. 82-4, is relevant here. I do not dwell on Hellenistic-Roman texts like the 1st Clementine letter; Dio Chrys. orat. 38-41 Arnim; Aelius Arist. orat. 24 (44) Keil; Gregor. Naz. orat. 6, 22, 23 (Migne, PG. xxxv); Iamblichus ap. Stobaeum, ii. 33. 15 (ii, p. 257 Wachsmuth), although the sophistic origin of the bulk of their thought has been proved by Fuchs. Alexander's idea of Homonoia (cf. especially W. W. Tarn, *Proc. Brit. Ac.* xix, 1933, 123; *Am. J. Phil.* 60, 1939, 62) is not relevant here: nor the Hellenistic developments.

² On the history of the idea of the mixed constitution cf. especially P. Zillig, *Die Theorie*

von der gemischten Verfassung, diss. Würzburg, 1916; F. Solmsen, 'Die Theorie der Staatsformen bei Cicero de republ. I', *Philologus*, lxxxviii, 1933, 326; V. Pöschl, *Römischer Staat und griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero*, 1936 (a fine study). Also the *πάτριος πολιτεία* was considered conducive to homonoia, being (as Isocr. Panath. 141 says) a mixed form of aristocracy and democracy: cf. Thrasymachus, fr. 1 Diels, a speech *περί ὁμονίας* (as H. T. Wade-Gery suggests to me).

³ Cf. for instance, Euripides, fr. 21 Nauck²; Democritus, fr. 249, 250, 255 Diels; Archytas, fr. 3 D.; Xenoph. Mem. iii. 5. 16; Isocr. vii (Areop.) 35; Arist. Eth. Nic. viii. 1, 1155^a22; ix. 6, 1167^a24; Eth. Eud. vii. 7, 1241^a15 ff.; [Arist.] Magna Moralia, ii. 12, 1212^a13 (I cannot consider here the problems offered by the Aristotelian passages). The content of Antiphon's *περί ὁμονίας* is not yet established with certainty, but Fuchs (quoted n. 1, above) forcibly contributes to its reconstruction. It is a pity that Fuchs was ignored by recent students of Antiphon (myself included). Cf. Wilamowitz, *Arist. u. Athen*, i. 173 n.; the two dissertations by E. Jacoby, Berlin, 1908, and W. Altwegg, Basel, 1908; J. Stenzel, P.-W. Suppl. iv. 40, s.v. 'Antiphon'; F. Altheim, *Klio*, xx, 1926, 257; W. Aly, 'Formprobleme d. frühen griech. Prosa', *Philologus*, Suppl. 21. 3, 1929; A. Momigliano, *Riv. Fil.* lviii, 1930, 129; J. Mewaldt, *Genethliakon W. Schmid*, 1929, 78; J. H. Finley, *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.* l, 1939, 63; E. Bignone, *Studi sul pensiero antico* (a reprint of earlier papers), Napoli, 1939 (cf. O. Regenbogen, *Gnomon*, 1940, 97).

⁴ I have examined the material collected in *Thesaurus*, s.v. 'concordia' and 'discordia' and in Skard, cit., and have not been able to discover (as far as political doctrines of the Republican and Augustan times are concerned) any relevant

named in the speech of Canuleius (iv. 3 ff.) which is a programme of extension of rights: Livy calls the episode a *contentio libertatis dignitatisque* (iv. 6). On the other hand, the agreement of 367 B.C. is presented as a feature of concord, because it is interpreted, remarkably enough, as a reciprocal concession between patricians and plebeians: '... concessumque ab nobilitate plebi de consule plebeio, a plebe nobilitati de praetore uno qui ius in urbe diceret ex patribus creando. ita ab diutina ira tandem in concordiam redactis ordinibus' (vi. 42. 11). The *concordia ordinum* is substantially declared to be a mixed constitution. And a grant of Roman citizenship is usually not even registered under the heading of Concord.¹ Therefore one misses something in the interpretation of Roman Concord as given both by Greek and Roman writers.

Polybius and Cicero's *De Republica*, by analysing the Roman State in terms of Greek Homonoia, failed, in fact, to see that the strength of the Roman State did not rest only or chiefly on its mixed constitution, but on its capacity for extending privileges and opening its gates to new-comers. The failure is remarkable not only in Cicero, who in other works and from other points of view showed he well knew the value of the Roman idea of citizenship, but in Polybius himself. In comparing Sparta with Rome, he noticed that the mixed constitution of Sparta did not give her the quality of a successful imperialism. Yet he was unable to find the true solution (or, indeed, any solution) of the problem he had put to himself so clearly.

Machiavelli came nearer to the solution in his *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio*, a most important and original element of which—not always noticed—is that the analysis of the Roman constitution on Polybian lines is perfected by an analysis of Roman imperialism that Polybius was not able to make: 'O tu ragioni d'una repubblica che voglia fare un imperio, come Roma; o d'una che le basti mantenerla. Nel primo caso gli è necessario fare ogni cosa come Roma; nel secondo può imitare Vinegia e Sparta.' Indeed, Machiavelli saw that extension of rights in Rome and extension of rights to non-Romans were elements of the same policy. He concluded, however, that the extension of citizenship, by increasing the social conflicts, added perfection to the balance of the Roman constitution: not concord, but discord, helped Rome. Besides many other things, Machiavelli was himself too much rooted in the tradition of the theory of mixed constitution to be able to appreciate fully the implications of Roman Concord. The same is true to even a greater extent of Montesquieu in *De l'esprit des lois*. In the *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains* he obtains a deeper insight into Roman imperialism only by making much less capital out of the theory of the mixed constitution. 'Ainsi Rome n'étoit pas proprement une monarchie ou une république, mais la tête du corps formé par tous les peuples du monde' (ch. vi). This is a long way from the cognate Menenius fable and, incidentally, is a good instance of the old truism that Greek schemes must be modified to understand Rome. The Greek mixed constitution has been a great help, but also a heavy stumbling-block, to the understanding of the Roman constitution. One may be allowed to observe with due submission that even Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* is still too Greek.

OXFORD.

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO.

difference between Roman texts on *concordia* and Greek texts on *homonoia*, the more rigid class-distinction ('ordines') of Rome excepted. I quote a small selection of texts: Plaut. *Aul.* 475; Cato, *or.*, fr. 59 Malcovati; *auct. ad Herenn.* iv. 13. 19; Sallust, *Cat.* 9; *Iug.* 31, 41; Cic. *Rep.* ii. 42. 69; *Leg.* iii. 28; *De officiis*, ii. 22. 77; *Catil.* iv. 7. 15; *Philipp.* i. 9. 23; *ad Attic.* i. 18. 3; Livy, iii. 67. 1; vii. 21. 1; ix. 19. 17; 46. 6. Cf. also Dionys. Hal. ii. 11. 2 (on which M. Pohlenz, *Hermes*,

lix, 1924, 157; A. v. Premerstein, 'Vom Werden u. Wesen des Prinzipats', *Abh. Bayer. Ak.*, 1937, 9), vii. 55. 2. For Posidonius?, Diod. xxxiv. 25 and 33, on which cf. especially F. Klingner, *Hermes*, lxxiii, 1928, 165.

¹ I know only of one exception (but there may be more): Livy, i. 11. 2 'Romulum Hersilia coniunx . . . orat ut parentibus earum det veniam et in civitatem accipiat: ita rem coalescere concordia posse'.

MR. O. J. 1942, pp. effect in cvidens vivpity', if Pwind, if v

the more passages n as well as alleged to loose langu argument of onomat is of such

The ar are not co ever sugges any more one recogn

The ar ent conten Commenta standing, themselves most vivie language, has been p dignity, gr dejection, drawing of Maxa,⁷ mo given. Its

¹ This art needs some a paper on Poetry' read Oxford on 2 make it so f have wished and my visi of the publi seemed to ca other consi G. H. W. R Mr. T. F. H

² Lucr. v.

³ Virg. A

⁴ Soph. O

ONOMATOPOEIA AND THE SCEPTICS¹

MR. O. J. TODD, in his article on 'Sound and Sense in Classical Poetry' (*C.Q.* xxxvi, 1942, pp. 29-39), adopts a sceptical attitude towards those who find onomatopoeic effect in certain passages of classical poetry. If Munro remarks, on the line 'viva videns vivo sepeliri viscera busto',² that 'v often in alliteration expresses indignant pity', if Page hears in 'deficeret tantis navis surgentibus undis'³ the whistling of the wind, if various editors find Oedipus' taunt of Tiresias,

τυφλὸς τὰ τ' ὄτα τὸν τε νοῦν τὰ τ' ὄμματ' εἶ,⁴

the more expressive for its 'tauisms', Mr. Todd is not impressed, since he can find passages no less thick with *v*, *s*, and *t* respectively which clearly have no such effect, as well as passages similar in content which are not marked by the use of the letters alleged to be appropriate.⁵ The examples he collects are striking enough, and the loose language used by some commentators in pointing out their instances has made argument easier for the sceptics; but to the general question of the reality and value of onomatopoeia his arguments and examples are largely irrelevant. The whole issue is of such importance as to merit further discussion.⁶

The argument that sounds which are claimed to be onomatopoeic in one passage are not conspicuous in others of similar content clearly carries little weight. No one ever suggested, for example, that 'tauisms' is the *only* way of reinforcing indignation, any more than that spitting is the only way of emphasizing contempt. It is simply one recognizable way.

The argument that such sounds are no less conspicuous in some passages of different content vanishes if we do not claim more for onomatopoeia than we should. Commentators have used words unguardedly, and perhaps given rise to misunderstanding, in saying that sounds or rhythms 'express' or 'represent' meaning. Of themselves they can only emphasize it. We must not expect the subject of even the most vividly onomatopoeic passage to be conveyed to a hearer ignorant of the language, though interesting experiments might be tried. The regularity of spondees has been plausibly held to assist in conveying the idea of inactivity, and so of calm, dignity, greatness, length, solemnity, certainty, comfort, friendliness; or feebleness, dejection, loneliness, rarity; or on the other hand, intentness, sustained effort, or the drawing of a bow. I have abstracted this list from passages in the *Aeneid* cited by Maxa,⁷ most of which seem to me to be justly claimed as onomatopoeic for the reason given. Its diversity is not a *reductio ad absurdum*; it is merely a reminder that

¹ This article is of a provisional nature, and needs some apology. It is partly adapted from a paper on 'Sound and Sense in Augustan Poetry' read before the Classical Association at Oxford on 22 April 1941. I have been unable to make it so full and well documented as I should have wished, since war work limits my leisure and my visits to libraries. But the coincidence of the publication of Mr. Todd's article, which seemed to call for early comment, has outweighed other considerations. I am indebted to Mr. G. H. W. Rylands for several references, and to Mr. T. F. Higham for helpful criticisms.

² Lucr. v. 993.

³ Virg. *Aen.* vi. 354.

⁴ Soph. *O.T.* 371.

⁵ Mere counting is not enough. It makes a difference whether or no the letters coincide with the beginnings of words and with the beat of the verse.

⁶ In a more systematic account it would be well to treat Greek and Latin separately; we are so much surer of Latin pronunciation, and in Latin there is a more marked historical development.

⁷ 'Lautmalerei und Rhythmus in Vergils Aeneis' (*Wiener Studien* xix, 1897, pp. 88-103). I am indebted for this and other references to Norden's valuable Appendix VI to his *Aeneis* VI³, 'Die malerischen Mittel des vergilischen Hexameters', a rich collection of material on the subject.

onomatopoeia is only a reinforcement of semantic communication, and not, at this stage of evolution, an independent instrument.

Now it may often happen that the natural way of expressing a sentiment involves a chance association of sounds or rhythms which in some other particular context would be onomatopoeic. In such a case they have no special effect and we probably should not notice them if we were not on the look-out; for as sounds of themselves do not convey meaning, so they do not positively affect passages whose meaning they do not by nature reinforce; just as a chemical substance may be neutral when mingled with most others, but may cause an explosion when mingled with a certain one.

It is a principle—many would say, it is the essence—of good writing, that the words should express the meaning as vividly as words can; certainly it was the orthodox view in antiquity that τὸ πρέπον—*decorum*—was the cardinal virtue of style. Onomatopoeia is clearly a corollary of this principle. Ancient critics were far more interested in it than modern. At the very dawn of criticism Hippias wrote περὶ γραμμάτων δυνάμειος καὶ συλλαβῶν,¹ and Theophrastus treated of it in his περὶ λέξεως.² There are some excellent chapters on it in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *De Compositione Verborum* (14–20). 'The greatest poets and prose-writers', he says, '... often with curious and loving skill adapt the very syllables and letters to the emotions which they wish to represent.'³ They keep their eye on the object—πρὸς χρῆμα ὁρῶσιν. And he gives a number of examples from Homer of onomatopoeic sound and rhythm, analysing some in detail. It is worth remembering that, since Dionysius came to Rome in 30 B.C. and stayed there for at least twenty-two years,⁴ he very probably discussed poetry with Virgil and Horace. Plutarch has a passage in which he compares poetry and dancing. 'Dancing', he says, 'is a silent poetry, and poetry a speaking dance.' He dwells expressly on the value of onomatopoeia, giving instances from Euripides, Pindar, and Homer, and after quoting from Simonides exclaims: 'These passages almost seem to invite the hands and feet, or rather to pull and guide the whole body with their music, as with puppet-strings.'⁵

Onomatopoeia is defined (in its rhetorical sense) by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as 'the use of naturally suggestive words, sentences, and forms for rhetorical effect'. In default of further terminology I propose to use the word in this article to cover any reinforcement of sense by sound, rhythm, or verse technique. It is far from being an exact term. The quality it signifies may be said to exist wherever its presence is felt by a consensus of readers normally sensitive to it. No more objective criterion is possible.

Before examining its nature there are two main questions to be answered: Why is it so sporadic, even in good poetry? And why is it disprized by so many critics? In attempting to answer them I must assume hopefully that most of the examples I give are not purely subjective; many of them have been noted already by commentators.

In the first place, poets differ in their conception of the aim and nature of poetry. James Sutherland, in his book *The Medium of Poetry*, contrasts Wordsworth and Keats as two types of poet. Wordsworth was intent on reviving, as completely as he could in words, his moments of intense emotional experience. The revisions that he made in his works are all in the direction of more perfect presentation of a scene or event. With Keats poetry was far less *communication* and far more *making*. He revised to enrich and beautify. It is in poets of the Wordsworthian type that we shall expect to find the

¹ Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* 285 C.

² Dion. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* 16.

³ Loc. cit. 15. Tr. Rhys Roberts. οἱ χαριέστατοι ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων . . . τὰ γράμματα καὶ τὰς συλλαβὰς οἰκείας οἷς ἂν βούλωνται παραστήσαι

πάθειν ποικίλως φιλοτεχνοῦσιν.

⁴ *Ant. Rom.* i. 7.

⁵ *Quaest. Conv.* ix. 15. 2: . . . παρακαλεῖν τὴν χεῖρα καὶ τὸ πόδε, μᾶλλον δ' ὅλον ὥσπερ τισὶ μινθόους ἔλκειν τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐντείνειν.

subtlet.
words ag

Amor
to this.
as the G
artistic a
out for v
his matt
wells ove

The ince
rush of w
in the lin

A success

This rhy
uariae pe
heavy blo

and

In the lin

the light
will give

the even
wriggle c
hiatuses
pile moun

but in a s

The line c

¹ G. i. 10.

² G. ii. 1.

³ G. i. 38.

⁶ G. ii. 6.

⁸ G. ii. 1.

subtlest examples of onomatopoeia. Their mind and ear are continually trying out words against the idea that is there to be expressed and selecting those that light it up.

Among classical poets Virgil and Ovid provide a contrast in some ways analogous to this. In all literature there is probably no such finished piece of onomatopoeic art as the *Georgics*. Virgil's subject was such that he could afford to neglect no form of artistic aid, and since it dealt almost entirely with concrete objects and actions, it cried out for vivid representation to the mind's eye and ear. Hear how the farmer, dragging his mattock across the parched land, entices the trickling runnel step by step, till it wells over the barrier and babbles down over the pebbles to refresh the arid soil:

et cum exustus ager morientibus aestuat herbis
ecce supercilio cliuosi tramitis undam
elicit: illa cadens raucum per leuia murmur
saxa ciet, scatebrisque arentia temperat arua.¹

The incessant pounding of the sea (*on, on, on, un*) against the Lucrine dam, and the rush of water (five sibilants) through the gap into the Avernian Lake, are well suggested in the lines

Iulia qua ponto longe sonat unda refuso
Tyrrenusque fretis immittitur aestus Auernis.²

A succession of anapaestic words suggests the regular beating of birds' wings,

cum medio celeres reuolant ex aequore mergi.³

This rhythm only recurs once in the same book, and birds are again the subject: 'iam uariae pelagi uolucres'.⁴ The syllables *and*, *end*, and *und* can emphasize hard work and heavy blows, as in

ut uarias usus meditando extunderet artes⁵

and

scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus.⁶

In the line

aut summa nantes in aqua colludere plumas⁷

the light *in aqua* amid the spondees suggests to me the sudden twirl that a pair of feathers will give on the water's surface; just as in the rare rhythm of

nec rapit immensos orbes per humum, neque tanto⁸—

the even spondees followed by *per humum*, *neque tanto* suggest the alternate coil and wriggle of a snake's movement. Spondees, groaning *o*-sounds, and the gasping hiatuses between identical vowels⁹ combine to give an impression of effort as the giants pile mountain upon mountain, while the elisions suggest a continuous rolling movement:

ter sunt conati imponere Pelio Ossam
scilicet, atque Ossae frondosum inuoluere Olympum;

but in a strong, effortless, clean-cut line Jupiter sweeps their work aside:

ter Pater exstructos disiecit fulmine montes.¹⁰

The line describing rustic dancing,

det motus incompositos et carmina dicat,¹¹

¹ G. i. 107-11.

² G. ii. 163-4.

⁴ G. i. 383.

⁶ G. ii. 61.

⁸ G. ii. 153-4.

³ G. i. 361.

⁵ G. i. 133.

⁷ G. i. 369.

⁹ Virgil may have caught this idea from Homer's Sisyphus, who *lāan āno āθεσκε*. *Od.* xi. 596. Dionysius ascribes the effect in part to *τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν ὀνομάτων φύγμα*, *op. cit.*, ch. 20.

¹⁰ G. i. 281-2.

¹¹ G. i. 350.

is made appropriately uncouth by the presence of a single word between the caesuras, which upsets the normal interplay of ictus and accent. Robert Bridges, quoting the line

fluminaque antiquos subterlabentia muros,

speaks of the 'long level "subterlabentia", with its two little gliding syllables at the end in quiet motion against the solid "muros"'.¹ One drops naturally into such phraseology when rhythm and sense are so perfectly blended as they are in Virgil.

These few examples, taken exclusively from the first two books of the *Georgics*, may suffice to illustrate a side of Virgil's art conspicuous also in the *Aeneid*, from which countless examples could be cited.² We know from ancient sources with what minute care he worked, constantly revising and rejecting; and rarely do we feel that he has let his mind wander for one moment from the images he has to convey.

Now let us turn to Ovid. There is little onomatopoeia to be found in Roman Elegy at all.³ One cause may have been the stereotyped dactylic ending of the pentameter, which precluded any sustained subtlety of significant rhythm. But the main cause probably lies deeper. A new attitude to the art of writing had been propagated by the school of Isocrates. Abandoning the principle of expressiveness and propriety advocated by contemporary critics, they sought for their own sake the graces of style, pleasing sounds, and verbal architecture, which had been only a by-product of previous writing.⁴ Their influence spread in the fourth century and affected the poetry of the third. It was Hellenistic Greece that took Rome captive, and in the elegiac couplet the Romans found a medium which gave them a peculiar aesthetic pleasure over and above the sense, to which our only approach is in the heroic couplet. Tibullus, it has been remarked, was more musical composer than poet. Ovid, like Propertius, had much to give besides; but one has the impression that on the formal side he also was too much engrossed in producing the lilt, the music, the 'periodic', the rhetorical schemata, and the grammatical pattern, which together make up the peculiar charm of the elegiac art, to keep his sensibility in complete touch with the matter he was seeking to express.

This attitude to poetry is still more marked when we turn to the *Metamorphoses*. Here is a poem in fifteen books crammed full of dramatic stories—an opportunity, if ever there was one, for descriptive writing with the powerful aid of onomatopoeia. But what do we find? A swift and clear style, to be sure, which justifies the poet's reputation as a story-teller, but a remarkable lack of vivid pictures. As in the Hellenistic epyllia, it is the reactions of the characters that interest the poet, and as often as not the action is reduced to a minimum. Or if he does describe at length, it is his own bright ideas and rhetorical art on which his mind seems intent. How vividly he could have depicted the fall of Phaëthon!⁵ But instead he distracts us continually with daring conceits, rhetorical effects, and pleasing sounds: it was the Scorpion oozing its poison that terrified the youth into dropping the reins; nine lines are devoted to sheer music, the noble names of the mountains that were scorched, including Ida, once many-fountained, now dry, and Rhodope *tandem niuibus caritura*, and culminating in a resounding verse that Virgil might have envied,

aëraeque Alpes et nubifer Apenninus.

Then it was, he tells us, that the Ethiopians went black, and the deserts dry; and to balance the mountains we have twenty lines of noble names of rivers that were scorched, Xanthus burning not for the last time, molten gold flowing down the Tagus' bed, and

¹ *Collected Essays*, vol. ii, p. 56.

² See Maxa, *op. cit.*

³ One example occurs at *Amores*, i. 15. 5, 6, where spondaic heaviness suggests the tedium of the pedestrian pursuits to which *Liur edax*

sought to bind him:

nec me uerbosas leges ediscere, nec me
ingrato uocem prostituisse foro.

⁴ Dion. Hal. *De Isocrate*, 2.

⁵ ii. 195-324.

the Nile
leapt no
hardly a
of twen
a pictur
finally s
the scat
at the e

What a
mention

Less
poeia in
describ

Here ag
the orde
forth. ?
given us

I ha
It is ess
Ovid es
flexible
are shor
in the fl
which p
poeic ef
pursues

List
see if yo

¹ 319-2
more dra

² P.L.

³ i. 343

⁴ *Werk*

p. 438. N

⁵ Mr.

the Nile hiding his head, *quod adhuc latet*. Neptune dared not surface; the dolphins leapt no more; and the Earth-mother held her hand before her face, and although hardly able to speak (*presserat ora uapor*) contrived to make a highly rhetorical speech of twenty-three lines. What fun it all is! But it is a baroque congeries of ideas, not a picture. What hand has the Earth to hold before her face? This personification finally shuts out from the mind any realistic image it may have pieced together from the scattered details. And as for the hero of this long episode—four inconspicuous lines at the end suffice to describe his final plunge:

at Phaëthon, rutilos flamma populante capillos,
uoluitur in praeceps longoque per aëra tractu
fertur, ut interdum de caelo stella sereno
etsi non cecidit, potuit cecidisse uideri.¹

What a contrast to Milton's vivid description of the fall of Mulciber, whom he was only mentioning incidentally:

from Morn
to Noon he fell, from Noon to dewy Eve,
a Summer's day; and with the setting Sun
dropt from the Zenith like a falling star
on Lemnos th' Aegaeon isle.²

Lessing, who, to judge from some notes he left, was on the look-out for onomatopoeia in the *Metamorphoses*, makes an illuminating comment on the following lines describing the re-emergence of the earth after the Flood:

flumina subsidunt, collesque exire uidentur;
iam mare litus habet, plenos capit alueus amnes,
surgit humus; crescunt loca decrescentibus undis;
postque diem longam nudata cacumina siluae
ostendunt, limumque tenent in fronde relictum.³

Here again we have a number of details; but, as Lessing points out,⁴ they are not in the order of their occurrence: the hills should appear before the rivers subside, and so forth. The poet has not fixed his inward eye on the continuous process at all; he has given us a series of jumbled lantern-slides, not a film.

I have searched the *Metamorphoses* for onomatopoeia and found surprisingly little.⁵ It is essentially the poem of a Roman elegiac poet. Bent on swiftness and lightness, Ovid eschews the elisions and irregularities that make Virgil's hexameters so fine and flexible a medium for descriptive writing. As in the new rhetoric of his day, the units are short; they had to be, because they have point, and the point must not be muffled in the flowing robes of periods. This characteristic leaps to the eye in the old editions, which print semicolons for commas. Only occasionally does it allow of an onomatopoeic effect, almost by accident; as in the broken phrases panted out by Apollo as he pursues Daphne.⁶

Listen to the lines in which Ovid describes the storm that created the Deluge,⁷ and see if you can detect any element of onomatopoeia.

protinus Aeoliis Aquilonem claudit in antris,
et quaecumque fugant inductas flamina nubes
emittitque Notum; madidis Notus euolat alis,

¹ 319-22. The fall of Icarus (viii. 225-30) is no more dramatic.

² *P.L.* i. 743-7.

³ i. 343-7.

⁴ *Werke*, ed. Lachmann-Müncker, vol. xv, p. 438. Norden, op. cit., p. 413.

⁵ Mr. A. Polack draws my attention to the

frogs of vi. 368, who 'quamuis sint *sub aqua*, *sub aqua* maledicere temptant'. No doubt I have missed some good examples, but my point is that one would have expected many more in so artistic a poet.

⁶ i. 503-24.

⁷ i. 262-73.

terribilem picea tectus caligine uultum.
 Barba grauis nimbis; canis fluit unda capillis;
 fronte sedent nebulae; rorant pinnaeque sinusque;
 utque manu lata pendentia nubila pressit,
 fit fragor; inclusi funduntur ab aethere nimbi.
 Nuntia Iunonis uarios induta colores
 concipit Iris aquas, alimentaue nubibus adfert.
 Sternuntur segetes et deplorata coloni
 uota iacent, longique perit labor irritus anni.

The abrupt *fit fragor* at the beginning of a line is perhaps the nearest approach. The havoc among the crops is told in a line composed for the most part of spondees; and the frigid personification of Notus with his beard and wing-plumage forbids any visualization of a real storm. And now listen to Virgil's storm that overwhelms the farmer in the *Georgics*:¹

saepe etiam immensum caelo uenit agmen aquarum
 et foedam glomerant tempestatem imbribus atris
 collectae ex alto nubes; ruit arduus aether
 et pluuiā ingenti sata laeta boumque labores
 diluit: implentur fossae et caua flumina crescunt
 cum sonitu feruetque fretis spirantibus aequor.
 Ipse Pater, media nimborum in nocte, corusca
 fulmina molitur dextra; quo maxima motu
 terra tremit; fugere ferae et mortalia corda
 per gentes humilis strauit pavor: ille flagranti
 aut Athon aut Rhodopen aut alta Ceraunia telo
 deicit; ingeminant Austri et densissimus imber;
 nunc nemora ingenti uento, nunc litora plangunt.

Notice how the spondees, the elisions, and the *m*-sounds help to suggest the gathering of the storm; in what swift dactyls the flood sweeps down on the crops; and how the rain hisses with *f*'s and *s*'s on the waters: then the ominous *o*-sounds of the blackening thunder-clouds; the shivering *r*'s of the cowering creatures below; the deathly pause at *pavor*; the flickering *l*'s of the lightning—*ille flagranti*, the sharp crackle and roar of the thunder,

aut Athon aut Rhodopen aut alta Ceraunia—;

the renewed hissing of the downpour, and the reiteration of accented *e*'s—*nunc nēpora ingēnti uēnto*—that are the gusts of wind through the woods. Notice too how the operative verbs, *diluit*, *deicit*, are stored up to swoop at the beginning of the next line. Can anyone, comparing these two passages, still maintain that onomatopoeia is largely a matter of chance, or that it has no important part to play in poetry?

But it is going too far to say that onomatopoeia, or even the quality of propriety that embraces it, is essential to good poetry. There are so many other virtues which may overshadow or even preclude it. We have seen that so great an artist as Ovid dispensed with it. In *Paradise Lost* there are passages in which strict appropriateness of language is sacrificed to the maintenance of a consistently elevated tone, though Milton was second to none in sensitivity to words. Nor is onomatopoeia suited to all types of poetry. I have mentioned the descriptive *Georgics* as an ideal theme for it. The dialogue of drama, on the other hand, is less obviously so, being rarely descriptive; it is, however, expressive, and when Andromache in despair abandons Astyanax to his murderers

ἀλλ' ἄγετε, φέρετε, ῥίπτει', εἰ ῥίπτειν δοκεῖ.
 δαίνυσθε τοῦδε σάρκας,²

¹ i. 322-34.

² Eur. *Tro.* 774-5.

few will care to deny that the broken metre emphasizes the breakdown of her self-control, and that it was intended to do so by 'the most pathetic of the poets'. Where there is scope for description, as in the messenger speeches, the role of onomatopoeia increases; and never has it been more finely used than in that breathless moment in the *Bacchae* when the god, laying hands on the pine-tree top,

κατῆγεν, ἦγεν, ἦγεν, ἐς μέλαν πέδον.¹

Finally, the main use of words being semantic, much of literature would not succeed in its object any better if, at the cost of great pains, its diction were made more expressive, and where it would, suitable words often simply do not exist.

τύχη τέχνην ἔσπερξε καὶ τέχνη τύχην.

Where *τύχη* fails, the poet must do the best he can without her. When, however, Sophocles' Oedipus, burning to tell Tiresias that he is blind in ears and mind and eyes, spits it out triumphantly in a spate of 'taus',

τυφλὸς τὰ τ' ὤτα τὸν τε νοῦν τὰ τ' ὄμματ' εἶ,

surely this is no insignificant coincidence, but a gift of the goddess to a great poet.

So much for reasons why the incidence of onomatopoeia is sporadic. There remains the second question, Why is it disprized by so many critics? 'The attempt to be onomatopoeic seems just a shade below the dignity of great composition', says Mr. Todd.² How surprised Virgil and Wordsworth and Tennyson would have been to hear it! We may grant that when it is too obvious and self-conscious, it may be tiresome in distracting our attention from the object to the poet's cleverness. But when it helps to present a living image to the inward eye, giving colour to what would otherwise be mere black and white, then it belongs to the realms of the imagination. It should be like good blood, not good cosmetics. Unfortunately it is only the more obvious cases that are commonly noted by editors, who do not care to risk seeming too fanciful.³ Hence the impression that onomatopoeia is at best a *tour de force*, at worst a childish trick.

Commentators have also provoked the sceptics by saying that the poet 'intended' his words to produce this or that onomatopoeic effect, since there are many who resent the imputation of too much self-consciousness to poets whom they admire. As the poet's imagination ranges in search of the perfect expression, it may light on the one which satisfies him without his knowing the reason. Some poets will be more self-conscious than others, and the critic may be better able to explain the mechanical cause of a verbal effect than the poet. The question is relevant only to the study of poetic psychology, not to literary exegesis.

Finally, there is nothing so subjective as images conjured up by words. A large proportion of what seems onomatopoeic to one man will not seem so to another. Thus the line

deficeret tantis naus surgentibus undis

would not have struck me as onomatopoeic, because my private mental image of the storm is a visual one of towering waves, not an auditory one of whistling winds. A single passage may even seem onomatopoeic to two readers in quite different ways. Or an obviously unusual combination of sounds may be explained (perhaps unhappily) by a commentator because he feels that it calls for an explanation, not because he is sensitive to its aesthetic effect.⁴ Again those who make a *conscious* search for onomatopoeia are likely to convince themselves of the reality of a certain number of mare's nests.

¹ Eur. *Bacch.* 1065.

² Op. cit., p. 39. He is speaking mainly of tragedy in this place; but he also confesses that the confirmation of his scepticism which he finds in his investigations is not disappointing to him in general.

³ Among English commentators T. E. Page

was especially sensitive to onomatopoeia and willing to communicate his experience. Like Tennyson, he used to recite onomatopoeic passages with vivid effect, marred only by his use of the English pronunciation of Latin and Greek.

⁴ As in the case of some of the comments on *O.T.* 371 cited by Todd, op. cit., p. 32.

This admitted element of subjectivity tends to discredit the whole idea. But the fact remains that the majority often agree in finding a particular passage onomatopoeic for a particular reason. The dispute will never be settled. For however many inconsistencies the sceptics point out, the believers will never lose their faith, because their feeling is something vital in their appreciation of poetry. The sceptics accuse them of being fanciful: they accuse the sceptics of being *τυφλοί τὰ ὦτα*. The two sides range themselves, I suspect, according to a more fundamental antagonism.¹ There are ultimately two kinds of reader, each of which believes that to it alone is given a true appreciation of literature. The contrast between them is pointed in a striking, if exaggerated, manner by Rémy de Gourmont:

To the reader who draws his emotions from the very substance of what he reads is opposed the reader who only feels what he reads to the extent that he can apply it to his own life, to his griefs, to his hopes. He who enjoys the literary beauty of a sermon by Bossuet cannot be touched by it religiously, and he who weeps for the death of Ophelia has no aesthetic sense. These two parallel categories of writers and readers constitute the two great types of cultivated humanity. In spite of shades and overlappings, no understanding is possible between them. They despise each other, for they do not understand each other. Their animosity extends in two wide, sometimes subterranean, streams throughout literary history.²

Procul este, profani! What follows is for the believer. 'My first notions of words are truly wild and strange,' says Socrates in the *Cratylus*, 'but I will tell you them if you like.' Some of my examples may seem fanciful, but the subject can only be discussed on a basis of individual experience.

Words are by origin imitative—that has been generally agreed from the time of Plato onwards. In the *Cratylus*³ Socrates, maintaining this view, makes bold to say what qualities various letters 'imitate'; that *ρ* represents motion, *ι* penetration, *φψζσ* breathlessness or activity, *λ* liquidity or smoothness, *γλ* glutinousness, *ν* inwardness, *ο* rotundity. We may notice, and Plato seems to be aware, that it is not so much the sound as the gesture of the mouth when uttering it that is imitative. This conforms strikingly to some modern theories of the origin of language. Sir Richard Paget, in his *Human Speech*,⁴ expands the view that when primitive man began to speak, subjective imitation with the mouth came first, and voicing only later; that the sounds were originally mere symptoms of the mouth-gestures. On this principle the word *ᾠόν* well represents the rotundity of an egg's exterior, the word 'egg' its glutinous interior. In passages of poetry that strike one as onomatopoeic in some vague way it will often be found on examination that the effect is due to sympathetic mouth gesture, not to the echo of a sound. We see, then, how Socrates could include abstractions such as inwardness in his list of things imitated by letters.

The elder Scaliger, in his *Poetics*,⁵ gives a list analogous to that in the *Cratylus*: *A* (*ah*) represents breadth, *U* obscurity, *I* length, *L* softness, *O* greatness.⁶ On a principle of mouth-gesture Paget invented a skeleton language and found afterwards that it corresponded remarkably to primitive Polynesian. His word for big, 'Oh', not only tallies with Scaliger's list, which he did not know, but turned out to be the word for

¹ Though onomatopoeia reinforces the literary element in poetry, its main effect is on the aesthetic side. It appeals to those whose pleasure in poetry is in the words.

² *Le Problème du Style* (1902). Tr. R. Aldington, *Selections*, pp. 104-5.

³ 426-7.

⁴ See esp. pp. 174-5.

⁵ iv, ch. 47 f. Norden, op. cit., p. 413.

⁶ The differences between this list and Plato's are no argument against the validity of either, for one sound or rhythm can *assist* in emphasizing many things. Cf. the case of spondees already mentioned. *T*, the instrument of Oedipus' contempt, helps Virgil to depict a choppy sea (*G.* i. 356-7): 'continuo uentis surgentibus aut freta ponti incipiunt agitata tumescere.'

'big' in
Americ
adult l
of *u* is l
languag
more a
imitativ
survive
syllable
he is de

Rhy
too can
the on
techniq
analog
derived
source a
operatin
associat
Let

(1) *I*
There is

because
often w
The sou
l sounds

and agai

and yet

Scarcely
is the onl

(2) *S*
fumida lu
by the ro
The sugg
as we saw
reason of

¹ Op. ci

² *Epode*
motion, ca
of rivulet

'big' in ancient Japanese, and also in a private language invented for himself by an American boy aged three and a half who refused to learn English.¹ Many words in adult languages retain their primitive onomatopoeic quality; the muffled obscurity of *u* is heard in *mutus*, *murmur*, *susurrus*, the gliding *l* in *φλόξ*, *flamma*, *lux*. But when languages grow up and become semantic, they cease to care about imitation, and pay more attention to derivation and analogy. It is the part of the poet to restore the imitative quality of language, not merely by selecting such onomatopoeic words as survive, but by combining elements not in themselves onomatopoeic, letters and syllables of words of any kind, in such a way that they help to suggest the thing or action he is describing.

Rhythms are no less an aid to meaning than sounds and mouth-gestures, and they too can represent abstract qualities, by extension. Cases are quite common in which the onomatopoeic effect would only be felt by a reader who was familiar with the technique of the verse. The verse, by a kind of metaphor, is made to do something analogous to the subject. Indeed a large proportion of onomatopoeia is metaphor derived from the structure of the language, and the pleasure we take in it has the same source as that we take in all metaphor, the simultaneous perception of a single idea operating in two distinct fields of association, the enriching of one field with the associations of the other.

Let us now distinguish and illustrate various kinds of onomatopoeia.

(1) *Imitation of sounds*. This is the simplest and most generally recognized form. There is not much point in drawing attention to the baaing and mooing of Virgil's

balatu pecorum et crebris mugitibus amnes,²

because it is due solely to words which are themselves onomatopoeic inventions. But often words which have no imitative origin become onomatopoeic when combined. The sound of running water can well be suggested, as in our word 'trickle', by *i*, *c*, and *l* sounds. We hear it in an early poem of Horace,

mella caua manant ex ilice; montibus altis
leuis crepante lympa desilit pede,³

and again at the Bandusian spring,

me dicente cauis impositam ilicem
saxis unde loquaces
lympae desiliunt tuae,⁴

and yet again while Virgil watches the farmer enticing his runnel,

ecce supercilio cliuosi tramitis undam
elicit.⁵

Scarcely one of the words in any of these passages is by origin imitative; indeed *lympa* is the only word contributing to the sound-effect which is connected with water at all.

(2) *Sympathetic mouth-gesture*. Lessing remarked that a phrase in the *Aeneid*, *tum fumida lumine fuluo inuolui*,⁶ was onomatopoeic because the thing described is imitated by the rolling, tortuous movement which the tongue makes in pronouncing the words.⁷ The suggestion of abstract qualities is less tangible, but peculiarly effective. Scaliger, as we saw, considered that *a*-sounds could suggest breadth and *u*-sounds obscurity, the reason obviously being that the mouth is broadened in pronouncing *a*, closed and con-

¹ Op. cit., pp. 139 ff.

² G. iii. 554.

³ *Epode XVI*, 47-8. R. Socrates' letter of motion, can also help, as in Tennyson's 'myriads of rivulets hurrying through the lawn', a line

presumably suggested by Horace's *et properantis aquae per amoenos ambitus agros* (A.P. 17).

⁴ O. iii. 13, 14-16.

⁵ G. i. 108-9.

⁶ vii. 76.

⁷ Loc. cit.

tracted in pronouncing *u*. Before becoming acquainted with his remarks I had felt that this accounted for the vividness of the contrast in Horace's lines on Archytas,

Te maris et terrae numeroque carentis arenae
mensorem cohibent, Archyta,
pulueris exigui prope litus parua Matinum
munera . . .¹

(3) *Expressive mouth-gesture*. For whatever reason, men have universally spat in contempt, hissed in hatred, and pouted in scorn, and the letters *t*, *s*, and *p* by shaping the mouth for these gestures, can reinforce the meaning of the words. In the famous examples referred to by Mr. Todd *t* does seem to emphasize Oedipus' contempt for Tiresias

τυφλὸς τὰ τ' ὦτα τὸν τε νοῦν τὰ τ' ὄμματ' εἴ,

and *s* Medea's hatred of Jason

ἔσωσά σ', ὡς ἴσασιν Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι . . .

The hybristic scorn of Aeschylus' Agamemnon for the burning ashes of Troy finds no less vivid expression in a line remarkable for its seven *p*'s,

σποδὸς προπέμπει πίνοντας πλούτου πνοάς.²

(4) *Significant euphony and cacophony*. The ancients were unusually sensitive to the beauty and ugliness of certain letters. Democritus wrote *περὶ καλλοσύνης ἐπέων, περὶ εὐφώνων καὶ δυσφώνων γραμμάτων*.³ But it is impossible for us, whose ear is tuned to a different language, to be sure that we shall always hear beauty and ugliness where they did. There are indications, however, that they used specially euphonious language in speaking of beautiful things, and cacophonous in speaking of ugly. An excess of sibilants offended the Roman ear,⁴ and when Virgil's Menalcas wishes to convey the hideousness of Damoetas' playing, he uses them freely, particularly the impure *s*:

non tu in triuiis, indocte, solebas
stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen?⁵

Milton uses the same means, a sequence of *st*, *sh*, *sc*, *tch*, *st*, as well as a flat disharmony of the less euphonious vowels, to achieve a similar effect:

and when they list, their lean and flashy songs
grate on their scrannel pipes of wretched straw.⁶

Here, it may be said, only simple sound-imitation is involved. There are cases, however, in which no sound is involved, but only ugliness of subject-matter. The offensive sibilant bristles like a weed in Horace's stanza on dropsy:

crescit indulgens sibi dirus hydrops,
nec sitim pellit, nisi causa morbi
fugerit uenis et aquosus albo
corpore languor.⁷

(5) *Significant rhythm*. The more flexible Greek lyric metres obviously gave scope for significant rhythm, and I will confine myself here to a few instances in which one poet, Horace,⁸ obtains onomatopoeic effects from metres allowing of little or no

¹ O. i. 28. 1-4.

² Ag. 820. Cf. the scornful in Psalm xxii. 7: 'They shoot out their lips.' Aeschylus' line has a double effect. If you think of Agamemnon, it emphasizes his hybris; if you think of Troy, it makes vivid the rich puffs of smoke that rise from the ruins.

³ Diog. Laert. ix. 48.

⁴ Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, p. 58, n.

⁵ E. iii. 26-7.

⁶ Lycidas, 123-4.

⁷ O. ii. 2. 13-16.

⁸ Norden, op. cit., p. 421, refers to 'der in diesen Dingen sonst recht zurückhaltende

variati
he wri

Heinz
popul
out res

Coinci
double
fanning

The rel

Horace
elisions

'The lin
In the l
he cont

But this

'Aux arm
holds it

(6) M
Science'

'How be
accent of

Horaz'. Y
examples
obvious ki
prohibebat
stridere se
78); whir
(A.P. 22)
fossor ter
4599.7

variation. Addressing Iullus on the expected triumphal return of Augustus to Rome, he wrote in Sapphics,

tum meae, si quid loquar audiendum,
uocis accedet bona pars, et 'o sol
pulcher, o laudande' canam recepto
Caesare felix.¹

Heinze pointed out that 'ó sol púlcher, ó laudánde' suggests the trochaic rhythm of the popular verses shouted at triumphs. The love-sick poet in the Eleventh Epode sets out resolutely for home, but soon his feet betray him:

iussus abire domum ferebar incerto pede.²

Coincidence of ictus and accent reflects a steady, undulating motion, and the lingering double /'s suggest hovering, in the lovely image in the Fifteenth Epode of the breeze fanning the locks of Apollo,

íntonsósque agítáret Apóllinis áúra capíllis.³

The relentless pounding of the sea is well suggested by the reiterated quadrisyllables of

quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare.⁴

Horace drives lumbering up to the hills in a long-drawn verse full of rumbling *m*'s and elisions,

ergo ubi me in montes et in arcem ex urbe remoui.⁵

'The line too labours and the words move slow.'

In the Eleventh Aeneid Virgil has a vivid onomatopoeic picture of a tumult, in which he contrasts hot-headed youth and murmuring but powerless old age,

arma manu trepidi poscunt, fremit arma iuuentus:
fient maesti mussantque patres.⁶

But this is surpassed by Horace's description of the tyrant's dread of fortune's fickleness,

iniurioso ne pede proruas
stantem columnam, neu populus frequens
ad arma cessantes, ad arma
concitet imperiumque frangat.⁷

'Aux armes, citoyens!' cries the mob, but the moderates, the solid molossus of *cessantes*, holds it back at first, till with a second cry it sweeps them along in a torrent of dactyls.

(6) *Metaphor from verse-technique*. Arthur Platt, in an essay on 'Poetry and Science', quotes two lines from Mary Coleridge:

Over the blúe sea goes the wind complaining,
And the blue séa turns purple as he goes.

'How beautifully there', he says, 'the change of the colour is echoed by the changing accent of the two words "blue sea"!' ⁸ This is a good example of what I have called

Horaz'. Yet his work contains many good examples of onomatopoeia. Some are of an obvious kind; stammering: *infans namque pudor prohibebat plura profari* (S. i. 6. 57); whispering: *stridere secreta diuisos aure susurros* (S. ii. 8. 78); whirling: *currente rota cur urceus exit?* (A.P. 22); stamping: *gaudet inuisam pepulisse fossor ter pede terram* (O. iii. 18. 15-16), but the

ones I shall quote are mostly subtler. See further J. Mazoureau, 'Horace Artiste de Sons' (*Mnemosyne*, iv, 1936, 85-94).

¹ O. iv. 2. 45-8.

² l. 20.

³ O. i. 11. 5.

⁴ 453-4.

⁵ *Nine Essays*, p. 179.

⁶ l. 9.

⁷ S. ii. 6. 16.

⁸ O. i. 35. 13-16.

'metaphor from verse-technique'. Here are some more from Horace. The rustic on the river-bank

expectat dum defluat amnis, at ille
labitur et labetur in omne uolubilis aeuum.¹

Not only do the repeated verb and the coincidence of ictus and accent in the second line suggest the steady flow of the river; we also wait, like the rustic, for the break in the line, the caesura, and it never comes. Virgil likewise slips a caesura when he wishes to represent a chariot out of control and heedless of the accustomed curb:

fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas.²

It is as though he were thinking of himself here, as he does explicitly elsewhere,³ as a charioteer driving a team of hexameters

'With necks in thunder cloathed and loud-resounding pace.'

The slurred hypermetron helps to suggest the faltering of the tongue in

cur facunda parum decor(o)
inter uerba cadit lingua silentio?⁴

Linking elisions help to draw the branches together in

quo pinus ingens albaque populus
umbram hospitem consociare amant
ramis.⁵

In the third ode of Book I (*Sic te diua potens*) Horace accustoms us for twenty-eight lines to a movement of the verse in which the stops come after the even, longer line; he then proceeds:

post ignem aethria domo
subductum macies et noua februm
terris incubuit cohors
semotique prius tarda necessitas
leti corripuit gradum.

As death has quickened its pace, so the metre has caught up a line.

(7) *Metaphor from word-form*. A scholiast notes as onomatopoeic the Homeric line,

λίγξε βίος, νευρή δὲ μέγ' ἔαχεν, ἄλτο δ' οἰστός.⁶

λίγξε is a word invented, no doubt, to imitate the twang of the bowstring, and called for no comment; but when he adds that the contraction of ἄλλετο to ἄλτο emphasizes the speed of the discharge,⁷ he recognizes the subtler onomatopoeia of metaphor from word-form. Platt (*ibid.*) quotes from Shelley,

He will watch from dawn to gloom
The lake-reflected sun illumine
The yellow bees in the ivy bloom.

'The enchantment of this', he says, 'greatly depends upon the fact that the second

¹ E. i. 2. 42.

² G. i. 514.

³ G. ii. 540-1. Cf. iii. 17-18.

⁴ O. iv. i. 35-6. At *Georgics*, i. 295, *aut dulcis musti Volcano decoquit umor(em)*, it suggests the boiling over of the cauldron.

⁵ O. ii. 3. 9-11.

⁶ Il. iv. 125. Schol. Ven, A. Norden, *Aeneis* VI², p. 415.

⁷ τοῦ δὲ ἄλτο συνετμήθη ἡ λέξις πρὸς τὸ τάχος τῆς ἀφίσεως.

syllable of "reflected" itself reflects in a weaker form the sound of the word "lake", just as the water reflects in a weaker form the sun.¹ And then from Housman,

And like a sky-lit water stood
the blue-bells in the azured wood.

'This time', he says, 'the magic effect is produced by repeating the syllable "like" inside the word "sky-lit", but inverted as a reflection is inverted in water.' (Note that he does not say that the poets were conscious of the way in which they were producing their effect: he is merely analysing his own experience.) His explanations may seem fanciful to many, but they show at least how aware a sensitive reader can be of the possibilities of 'metaphorical' onomatopoeia. I have not noted any case similar to these in a classical author, but should not be surprised to find several in Virgil.

L. P. WILKINSON.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ He says 'the bees', but he surely means 'the sun'.

COMMENTARIUM IN HIPPONACTEM P.OXY. 2176¹ fragm. 6

...]⁵ χηραμόν, [δ]που οἱ [ἴ]πνοι κ[α]ίονται· λέγει δὲ τὰς καμεί[ς] [νους· ἴ]πνους δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξείπου· | ⁶[τὸ . . .]λόμεν[ον] ἐν τῷ στατί ὅ[τ] [δωρ] ἐνδύουλη ἡ[ς] φησιν | ⁸[ca. 17 ll.]. εσθαί χ . 9ρ . [. .] ⁹ca. 12 ll.]^ε γυναικ[ο]π[ι]πην· λ[. .] ¹⁰ca. 10 ll.] τώματα τὰ ἐναπολ[ει]φ[ε]ντα τῷ κλι[β]άνῳ περικαγμῇ | ¹²[ca. 11 ll.]. ινας οὐς ἐνοι ἀττ[α] ¹³ράγους καλοῦσιν] . . .

3 [δ]που conieci: [.]ποι pap. || 4 ἴπνοι supplevi || 5-7 suppl. E. Lobel (qui supplementa 6-7 hoc mense Septembri liberaliter mecum communicavit). de στατί cf. supra p. 55¹ || 9-13 supplevi (11 κλι iam Lobel). γυναικοπίπης Eustathius (851. 54) videtur sumpsisse ex Hipponacte. supra l. 12 est scholion interlineare τὰ κεκλα]σμένα τῶν ἄρτων . . . [. de ἀττάραγος (ττ ex π corr. pap.) cf. locos in Thesouro collectos, imprimis Athen. 646 c.

P. MAAS.

¹ Cf. supra p. 54. Interea in fr. 1. col. I. 14 legi τὴν ἐρόσυν ρίνα approbante Lobelio, qui hinc orsus in Hipponacte restituit ἐπειδὴ ρίνα θεό[συν] . . .]eis, collatis Archilochi (?) et Alcae papyris ineditis, quae adiectivum θεοσύλης iam septimo ante Chr. saeculo usitatum fuisse demonstrant.

'metaphor from verse-technique'. Here are some more from Horace. The rustic on the river-bank

expectat dum defluat amnis, at ille
labitur et labetur in omne uolubilis aeuum.¹

Not only do the repeated verb and the coincidence of ictus and accent in the second line suggest the steady flow of the river; we also wait, like the rustic, for the break in the line, the caesura, and it never comes. Virgil likewise slips a caesura when he wishes to represent a chariot out of control and heedless of the accustomed curb:

fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas.²

It is as though he were thinking of himself here, as he does explicitly elsewhere,³ as a charioteer driving a team of hexameters

'With necks in thunder clothed and loud-resounding pace.'

The slurred hypermetron helps to suggest the faltering of the tongue in

cur facunda parum decor(o)
inter uerba cadit lingua silentio?⁴

Linking elisions help to draw the branches together in

quo pinus ingens albaque populus
umbram hospitalem consociare amant
ramis.⁵

In the third ode of Book I (*Sic te diua potens*) Horace accustoms us for twenty-eight lines to a movement of the verse in which the stops come after the even, longer line; he then proceeds:

post ignem aetheria domo
subductum macies et noua februm
terris incubuit cohors
semotique prius tarda necessitas
leti corripuit gradum.

As death has quickened its pace, so the metre has caught up a line.

(7) *Metaphor from word-form*. A scholiast notes as onomatopoeic the Homeric line,

λίγξε βιός, νευρή δὲ μέγ' ἵαχεν, ἄλτο δ' οἰστός.⁶

λίγξε is a word invented, no doubt, to imitate the twang of the bowstring, and called for no comment; but when he adds that the contraction of ἄλλετο to ἄλτο emphasizes the speed of the discharge,⁷ he recognizes the subtler onomatopoeia of metaphor from word-form. Platt (*ibid.*) quotes from Shelley,

He will watch from dawn to gloom
The lake-reflected sun illumine
The yellow bees in the ivy bloom.

'The enchantment of this', he says, 'greatly depends upon the fact that the second

¹ E. i. 2. 42.

² G. i. 514.

³ G. ii. 540-1. Cf. iii. 17-18.

⁴ O. iv. i. 35-6. At *Georgics*, i. 295, *aut dulcis musti Volcano decoquit umor(em)*, it suggests the boiling over of the cauldron.

⁵ O. ii. 3. 9-11.

⁶ Il. iv. 125. Schol. Ven, A. Norden, *Aeneis* VI², p. 415.

⁷ τοῦ δὲ ἄλτο συνετήθη ἡ λίξις πρὸς τὸ τάχος τῆς ἀφέσεως.

syllable of "reflected" itself reflects in a weaker form the sound of the word "lake", just as the water reflects in a weaker form the sun.¹ And then from Housman,

And like a sky-lit water stood
the blue-bells in the azured wood.

'This time', he says, 'the magic effect is produced by repeating the syllable "like" inside the word "sky-lit", but inverted as a reflection is inverted in water.' (Note that he does not say that the poets were conscious of the way in which they were producing their effect: he is merely analysing his own experience.) His explanations may seem fanciful to many, but they show at least how aware a sensitive reader can be of the possibilities of 'metaphorical' onomatopoeia. I have not noted any case similar to these in a classical author, but should not be surprised to find several in Virgil.

L. P. WILKINSON.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ He says 'the bees', but he surely means 'the sun'.

COMMENTARII IN HIPPONACTEM P.OXY. 2176¹ fragm. 6

. . .]ς χηραμόν, [δ]που οἱ [ἴ]πνοι κ[α]ίονται· λέγει δὲ τὰς καμεί[ς] [νους· ἴ]πνους δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξειποῦν | ⁶[τὸ . . .]λόμεν[ον] ἐν τῷ στατί ὅ[τ] [δωρ]ενδιουλη ἡ[ς] φησιν | ⁸[ca. 17 ll.] . εσθαι χ . ρρ . [. .] ⁹ca. 12 ll.]ς γυναικ[ο]πίπην· λ[. .] ¹⁰ca. 10 ll.]τῶματα τὰ ἐναπολ[ε]φ[ε] ¹¹θέντα τῷ κλιβάνῳ περικαγμα ¹²[ca. 11 ll.] . υας οὖς ἐνοι ἀττ[α] ¹³ράγους καλοῦσιν] . . .

3 [δ]που conieci: [.]ποι pap. || 4 ἴπνοι supplevi || 5-7 suppl. E. Lobel (qui supplementa 6-7 hoc mense Septembri liberaliter mecum communicavit). de στατί cf. supra p. 55¹ || 9-13 supplevi (11 κλι iam Lobel). γυναικοπίπης Eustathius (851. 54) videtur sumpsisse ex Hipponacte. supra l. 12 est scholion interlineare τὰ κεκλασμένα τῶν ἄρτων . . . [. de ἀττάραγος (ττ ex π corr. pap.) cf. locos in Thesaurο collectos, imprimis Athen. 646 c.

P. MAAS.

¹ Cf. supra p. 54. Interea in fr. 1. col. I. 14 legi τὴν ἐρῶσυν ῥίνα approbante Lobelio, qui hinc orsus in Hipponacte restituit ἐπειδὴ ῥίνα θεόσυν . . .]ας, collatis Archilochi(?) et Alcaeī papyris ineditis, quae adiectivum θεοσύλης iam septimo ante Chr. saeculo usitatum fuisse demonstrant.

ALCAEUS OF MESSENE, PHILIP V, AND ROME

THE rise of Macedon raised a series of political issues, which are reflected more or less clearly in the Greek literature of both the fourth and subsequent centuries: her capitulation before the might of the Roman legions did not immediately solve those problems, but merely seemed to change their formulation. It is therefore no coincidence that the later period, like the earlier, was one of passionate controversy and pamphleteering, and desperate shifts of allegiance in the attempt to find answers to the perennial problems of unity, hegemony, and freedom. Among the few precious fragments of this literature surviving to-day are the political epigrams of Alcaeus of Messene; and it is the purpose of the following paper to analyse their content, with a view to tracing how a not untypical Greek of the Peloponnese reacted to the emotions, the crises, the ideology, and the slogans of these years.¹

I. PHILIP V AND RHODES

Μακίνου τείχη, Ζεῦ, Ὀλύμπια πάντα Φιλίππῳ
ἀμβατά· χαλκείας κλεῖε πύλας μακάρων.
χθῶν μὲν δὴ καὶ πόντος ὑπὸ σκῆπτροισι Φιλίππου
δέδμηται· λοιπὰ δ' ἄπρος Ὀλυμπον ὁδός. (*Anth. Pal.* ix. 518.)

Since Bergk's explanation of the first line of this poem on Philip V of Macedon by Alcaeus of Messene in 1873,² its literal meaning has been clear. It has, however, been variously interpreted—as serious flattery of the Macedonian monarch,³ as a bitter recognition of his successes by a political adversary, and finally as a piece of railleury at Philip's alleged lack of success in the taking of cities.⁴ As Momigliano points

¹ For the subject and detail of this paper I am under a considerable debt to Dr. A. Momigliano, who suggested a closer study of Alcaeus in a review of my book *Philip V of Macedon* (1940), in the *Oxford Magazine* of 12 Feb. 1942, and subsequently allowed me to see in manuscript his paper 'Terra marique', which appeared in *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 53–64. I particularly wish to acknowledge my gratitude to Dr. Momigliano, since I have been unable to agree with several points of his reconstruction of Alcaeus' career. I am also grateful to Dr. P. Treves, who has helped me very much both by his keen interest and by his suggestions.

² Th. Bergk, *Philol.* xxxii, 1873, 678–81, 'Ein Epigramm des Alkaios v. Messene'. The traditional translation (e.g. that in Dübner's Didot edition) had treated μακίνου as the genitive of a place-name, variously connected with a Μακίνα or Μακίνιον in Aetolia, and Μηκώνη (Sicyon)—an error still to be found in J. W. Mackail, *Selected Epigrams from the Greek Anthology* (1906), p. 319, and A. Körte, *Hellenistic Poetry* (tr. Hammer-Hadas), 1928, p. 398. Adverting *Anth. Pal.* vi. 171, line 1, ἐμακύναντο, Bergk showed that μακίνου is a middle imperative, 'build higher'. (On his false deduction that *Anth. Pal.* vi. 171 was therefore also by Alcaeus

see below, p. 136, n. 2.) For the various earlier suggestions see Stadtmüller, ed. *Anth. Graec.* (Teubner), ad. loc., who points out that Bergk had in fact been forestalled by V. Obsopaeus. In line 1 I have accepted Stadtmüller's emendation of Ὀλύμπιε to Ὀλύμπια.

³ The epigram is regarded as serious flattery by Bergk, loc. cit., and *Poet. Lyr. Gr.* iii. 196; Knaack ap. Susemihl, *Gesch. d. gr. Litt. in d. Alexandrinerzeit* (1892), ii. 545; Wilamowitz, *Hellenist. Dichtung*, i (1924), 224; H. Stadtmüller, *Anth. Graec.*, ad loc.; Körte, op. cit. 398; and apparently C. Edson, *Harv. Stud.* xlv, 1934, 214, n. 4.

⁴ These authorities have seen in it an expression of hostility: O. Rossbach, *Jahrb. f. class. Philol.* xxxvii (vol. cxliii of *Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Paedagogik*), 1891, 97; K. Seeliger, *Messenien u. der achäische Bund* (Progr. Zittau), 1897, 15; C. Cessi, *La poesia ellenistica* (1912), 280–1; G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* (1921), iv. 1. 9–10; W. Paton, Loeb ed. of *Greek Anthol.* (1916–18), ad loc.; F. W. Walbank, *Philip V*, 120; C. A. Roebuck, *A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C.* (Chicago diss., 1941), 84, n. 86; R. Reitzenstein, *P-W*, s.v. 'Alkaios (13)', col. 1506; F. J. Brecht, *Motiv- u. Typengeschichte des griech. Spottepigramms*, *Philol. Suppl.-B.* xxii,

out,¹ the
by Alph

is certain
a writer
reader, v

What
sea, Alca
history h
Pella in
implicati
Rhodes a
Demetriu

In a page
last two
Demetriu
not to be
who reall

1930, 7–8;
1935, 8. G
2161, think
xvi. 6 (cor
exaggeratio
loc. cit., re
Antwort' t
poem. A L
L.) Wilcke
script), rec
does not ap

¹ *JRS*, x
² On this
stein, *P-W*
variously g
(so Rossba
two centur
and Dr. Tr
that either
or alternati
second cent
The suggest
Rossbach
Britain offe
tasteless res

out,¹ there are several good reasons for adopting the first of these views. The imitation by Alpheius of Mytilene (*Anth. Pal. ix. 526*)²:

Κλεῖε, θεός, μέγαλοιο πύλας ἀκμήτας Ὀλύμπου,
φρούρει, Ζεῦ, ζαθέαν αἰθέρος ἀκρόπολιν
ἤδη γὰρ καὶ πόντος ὑπέζευκται δορὶ Ῥώμης
καὶ χθών· οὐρανὴ δ' οἶμος ἔτ' ἔστ' ἄβαστος.

is certainly quite serious in tone—a strong argument, yet not wholly conclusive, since a writer two centuries later might well miss an irony apparent to a contemporary reader, who knew the circumstances in which the original epigram was composed.

What is decisive, however, is the fact that in claiming for Philip rule over land and sea, Alcaeus was adhering to a traditional Hellenistic formula, which possessed a long history both before and after Alcaeus' time, and probably originated in the court of Pella in the early years of the third century. This formula first occurs with its full implications in an anonymous epigram, celebrating the erection of the Colossus of Rhodes as a memorial to the city's historic and successful resistance to the siege by Demetrius Poliorcetes (*Anth. Pal. vi. 171*)³:

Αὐτῷ σοὶ πρὸς Ὀλύμπον ἐμακύναντο κολοσσὸν
τόνδε Ῥόδου ναῆται Δωρίδος, Ἀέλιε,
χάλκεον, ἀνίκα κύμα κατευνάσαντες Ἐννοῦς
ἔσπεψαν πάτραν δυσμενέων ἐνάρους.
οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πελάγους μόνον ἔκτισαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν γῇ
ἄδρὸν ἀδουλῶτον φέγγος ἑλευθερίας·
τοῖς γὰρ ἅψ' Ἡρακλῆος ἀεξηθεῖσι γενέθλας
πάτριος ἐν πόντῳ κτὴν χθονὶ κοιρανία.⁴

In a page of acute comment on this epigram Edson suggests that its point lies in the last two lines, which contain a taunt aimed at Poliorcetes, and insinuate 'that Demetrius, though he claimed to be a Heraclid through the Argeadae, was proven not to be a true Heraclid by his military and naval defeat at the hands of the Rhodians, who really were Heraclids, as Dorians'.⁵ And Momigliano has since shown how the

1930, 7-8; G. T. Griffith, *Camb. Hist. Journ. v. 1935*, 8. Geffcken, *P-W*, s.v. 'Samos (2)', col. 2161, thinks that this epigram, like *Anth. Pal. xvi. 6* (considered below) represents insulting exaggeration of Philip's power; whereas Seeliger, loc. cit., regards it as perhaps 'eine parodische Antwort' to the genuine flattery of the latter poem. A Leipzig dissertation of 1924, by J. (or L.) Wilcke, *De Alcaeo Messenio*, 120 pp. (typescript), recorded by Bursian and Marouzeau, does not appear to have been published.

¹ *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 53-4.

² On this epigram and its author see Reitzenstein, *P-W*, s.v. 'Alpheios (3)'; his date is variously given as Augustus' reign or Claudius' (so Rossbach, loc. cit.). This reply to Alcaeus two centuries later offers genuine difficulties; and Dr. Treves has suggested to me privately that either *Anth. Pal. ix. 526* is not by Alpheius or alternatively Alpheius drew on a source of the second century, when the issue was still alive. The suggestion is attractive; but perhaps, as Rossbach hinted, the Claudian conquest of Britain offered an occasion for the somewhat tasteless resuscitation of an antiquarian common-

place. Moreover, Alpheius' reply to Alcaeus is paralleled by his poem, *Anth. Pal. ix. 100*, in praise of Delos, which is a reply to *Anth. Pal. ix. 408*, by Antipater of Thessalonica.

³ The Colossus was 12 years in commission, and according to Pliny, xxxiv. 41 (reading, with the MS. B¹, lxvi for lvi, as Scaliger had already proposed) stood for 66 years before its destruction in the earthquake of c. 226 (on which see M. Holleaux, *REG*, xxxvi, 1923, 480-98 = vol. i of *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*, ed. L. Robert (1938), 445-62). If, as Benndorf, *Ath. Mitt.* i, 1876, 45-8, suggests, this epigram represents the dedicatory inscription, its date of composition is thus 293/2. See further C. Robert, *P-W*, s.v. 'Chares (15)', cols. 2130-1; H. van Gelder, *Gesch. d. alt. Rhodier* (1900), 384-5; Hiller v. Gaertringen, *Hist. gr. Epig.* 88; *P-W*, s.v. 'Rhodos', Suppl.-B. v, col. 785; Edson, *Harv. Stud.* xlv, 1934, 220.

⁴ With Edson, loc. cit., I follow Waltz in adopting in line 6 a suggestion of Stadtmüller, and read ἀδρὸν for ἀβρόν; the light of freedom should surely be 'strong', not 'delicate'.

⁵ Edson, op. cit. 221.

formula 'lordship by land and sea' became a recognized phrase in Hellenistic flattery, and has argued that, as here, it need not have any real correspondence to facts. Indeed, on the basis of this Rhodian epigram—for the Rhodians cannot be said ever to have exercised true *κοιρανία* by land and sea—he claims that *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518 is also without relation to any specific feats or possessions of Philip V, but merely recognizes an abstract *κοιρανία* which any Heraclid automatically and effortlessly enjoyed.¹

This view does not, however, take into account the close verbal connexion between the dedication of the Colossus and Alcaeus' epigram on Philip. The 'land and sea' theme was alone enough to link the two poems together in the mind of a cultivated Greek reader: but when in addition we find the by no means common word *μακυνᾶσθαι* in the first line of both poems, indeed as the *first* word in that by Alcaeus, and in both cases used in the middle voice;² and when the phrase *πρὸς Ὀλυμπόν* occurs in Alcaeus' last line in obvious echo of the first line of the Rhodian epigram—then it can hardly be doubted that Alcaeus meant his flattery of Philip to be a retort to the Rhodian taunt levelled at Philip's great-grandfather, Demetrius Poliorcetes.³

Now if this is true,⁴ certain things follow. Hitler's gesture at Compiègne in 1940 was significant only in relation to the change in Franco-German fortunes since 1918. If Alcaeus designed his epigram as a reply to Rhodes it was because Philip had avenged the defeat of his ancestor; in short, the imitation rules out Momigliano's view that Alcaeus' claim was mere court flattery, equally appropriate at any time before Cynoscephalae. Two facts of some importance can therefore be established. First,

¹ The equation 'Heraclid = lord by land and sea' seems to have grown up as a convenient form of flattery at the time when the various *diadochi* were busy claiming both Argead descent and the imperial heritage of Alexander. The virtue residing in the mere possession of Heraclid blood is already apparent, however, in Isocrates, *Philip*, 132: *σκέψαι δ' ὡς αἰσχρὸν περιρᾶν . . . τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ Κύρου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντας . . . βασιλεῖς μεγάλους προσαγορευομένους, τοὺς δ' ἄφ' Ἡρακλέους πεφυκότας . . . ταπεινότεροις ὀνόμασιν ἢ κείνους προσαγορευομένους*, and is stressed a century later by Phylarchus to justify the hegemony of the Spartan Cleomenes (*Plut. Cleom.* 16. 4: *τὸν ἄφ' Ἡρακλέους γεγονότα*). The fact that the Rhodians use the formula simply on the grounds that they have defeated Poliorcetes shows conclusively, I think, that the latter had already put forward his claim to it; I cannot agree with Momigliano that this one instance serves to establish the formula as attributable to any Heraclid, *independent of his actual achievement*. The formula in which the conceit crystallized may owe something to one aspect of Heracles himself: cf. Pindar, *Nem.* i. 61–3:

ὁ δὲ (Teiresias) οἱ φράζει· καὶ παντὶ στρατῷ ποῖαις
δμηλήσει τύχαις,
δοσσοὺς μὲν ἐν χέρσῳ κτάνων,
δοσσοὺς δὲ πόντῳ θήρας αἰδροδίκας.

and *Nem.* iii. 23–6:

δάμασε δὲ θήρας ἐν πελάγεσιν
ὑπερόχος, διὰ τ' ἐξερένασε τεναγέων

ρούς, ὅπα πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος,
καὶ γὰρ φράδασε.

From Mt. Oeta Heracles no doubt took *τὰν πρὸς Ὀλυμπόν ὁδόν*. Cf. Kaerst, *Gesch. d. Hell.* ii² (1926), 317.

² L. and S.⁸ gives no example for the middle use of this word except *Anth. Pal.* vi. 171. The repetition was observed by Bergk (see above, p. 134, n. 2), who drew the incorrect but pardonable conclusion that both poems were by Alcaeus.

³ Furthermore, Alcaeus' last line, on the still untrodden road to Olympus, falls very flat, if the conquest of land and sea is *merely* a traditional formula. In fact, the reference to Olympus pitches the tone of the epigram very high indeed, as can be seen from Pindar, *Pyth.* x. 27: *ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτ' ἀμβατὸς αὐτῷ* (i.e. a mortal man): the phraseology comes very near to that of deification (cf. Edson, *Harv. Stud.* xlv, 1934, 214, n. 4).

⁴ To this interpretation Dr. Momigliano has privately objected that Alcaeus' epigram has no reference to either the 'Heracles' or the 'Eleutheria' motifs. There can, however, be a retort without a point-for-point answer. The 'land-and-sea' claim, applied to an Antigonid, implies the boast of Heraclid descent; and the 'Eleutheria' motif, however appropriate to the Rhodian resistance to Poliorcetes (or to Macedonian policy in Greece), was better kept in the background in connexion with Philip's annexations in Asia Minor.

Anth. Pal. ix. 518
successes
late sum
Syll. 57
Apollo c
real vict
of 201 P
friendly)
the char
Thes
anonym

Here
that of
victory c
not been
details
'land and
various a
paign in
that the
to be by
Philip's
and sea'
Europe',
formula
analysis
definite n
firmly es

¹ Op. cit.

² As Ta
1941, 172),
unfavoura
by his Rh
op. cit. iv.

³ See *Ph*

⁴ Ibid. 6

ap. Treves
second ins

⁵ Polyb.

and his q
earthquak

⁶ See (f
Anth. Pal.

⁷ In line
θραστός K
and has

Anth. Pal. ix. 518 is, as De Sanctis argued,¹ to be connected with Philip's naval successes in 201² and his campaign against the mainland possessions of Rhodes in the late summer of that year.³ From this period there are two inscriptions (*IG.* xi. 4. 1100, *Syll.*³ 573; *IG.* xi. 4. 1101 (fragmentary))⁴ recording Philip's dedication to Delian Apollo of spoils from struggles *κατὰ γῆν* and *κατὰ θάλασσαν*; these celebrate the very real victories of that year. Secondly, Alcaeus' poem suggests that in his expedition of 201 Philip was looking back not only to Doson (whose policy towards Rhodes was friendly),⁵ but also to his great-grandfather Poliorcetes—an attitude in keeping with the character of a king who constantly sought to stress his identity with his ancestors.⁶

These facts may prove of assistance when we proceed to consider another—anonymous—epigram, to which Momigliano has also given some attention.

II. THE LORD OF EUROPE

Κοίρανος Εὐρώπας, ὁ καὶ εἰν ἀλλὶ καὶ κατὰ χέρσον
τόσσον ἄναξ θνατῶν, Ζεὺς ὅσον ἀθανάτων,
Εἰνοδίᾳ τὰ λάφυρ' Ἐκάτῃ θρασέος Κιροάδα,
καὶ τέκνων καὶ ὅλας γῆς ἔθετ' Ὀδρυσίδος,
υἱὸς ἑὺμμελία Δαματρίου· ἃ δὲ Φιλίππου
δόξα πάλιν θεῶν ἄγχι βέβακε θρόνων. (*Anth. Pal.* xvi. 6 (Plan).)⁷

Here Philip V, the Lord of Europe, with mastery by land and sea comparable to that of Zeus himself, is celebrated as the dedicator of spoils to Hecate from his victory over Ciroadas, a chieftain of the Thracian Odrysae. Hitherto this poem has not been dated with any certainty. It contains, however, three relevant factual details—the reference to Ciroadas and the Odrysae, the dedication to Hecate, and the 'land and sea' formula—and with the aid of these it is possible to narrow down the various alternatives. It has been suggested more than once that the Odrysian campaign in question was that carried out by Philip in 183 B.C.⁸ Bergk,⁹ it is true, insisted that the epigram must be considerably earlier, but this was because he assumed it to be by Alcaeus, and therefore necessarily prior to Cynoscephalae, when Alcaeus was Philip's avowed enemy. However, whether the author was Alcaeus or no, the 'land and sea' formula could scarcely be applied to Philip, nor could he be called 'Lord of Europe', after the Roman victory of 197. As Momigliano points out,¹⁰ even a traditional formula must not be too patently contradicted by the real situation; and if, as our analysis of *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518 suggested, the 'land and sea' motif tended to bear a definite relation to the historical situation, this *terminus ante quem* will be even more firmly established.

¹ Op. cit. iv. 1. 9–10, n. 26; cf. *Philip V*, 120.

² As Tarn has recently observed (*JRS*, xxxi, 1941, 172), the battle of Chios was at least less unfavourable to Philip than Polybius, misled by his Rhodian sources, implies; cf. De Sanctis, op. cit. iv. 1. 9, n. 23.

³ See *Philip V*, 125 f., and works there quoted.

⁴ Ibid. 67, n. 6, correcting the view expressed ap. Treves, *Les ét. class.* ix, 1940, 150, n. 1. The second inscription is extremely fragmentary.

⁵ Polyb. v. 89. 6–7 records the gifts of Doson and his queen Chryseis to the city after the earthquake of c. 226.

⁶ See (forthcoming) vol. xxxvii, p. 5, n. 6; and *Anth. Pal.* xvi. 6, line 5; υἱὸς ἑὺμμελία Δαματρίου.

⁷ In line 3 the MS. reads εἰνοδίᾳ τὰ λάφυρα κατὰ θρασέος Κιροάδα. The emendation was Hecker's and has been almost universally accepted

(contra Jessen, *P-W*, s.v. 'Enodia', col. 2635). *Εἰνοδίᾳ* might well stand alone (see below, p. 138, n. 9, and p. 139, nn. 1–4), but it is then difficult to give *κατὰ* a satisfactory sense. Hecker also emended the MS. *πάλαι* to *πάλιν* in line 6. See Dübner, ad loc. (Didot edition).

⁸ e.g. by Paton (Loeb ed.), Dübner (Didot ed.), Knaack ap. Susemihl, op. cit. ii. 547, n. 148. See Polyb. xxiii. 8. 4–7; Livy (Pol.), xxxix. 53. 12–13; details in *Philip V*, 242–3.

⁹ *Poet. Lyr. Gr.* iii. 196 n.

¹⁰ *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 56, n. 15. Momigliano quotes a suggestion by Professor Wade-Gery that the poem might date to Philip's last years, and be designed to bolster up morale at home; but Momigliano is undoubtedly correct in establishing 197 as a *terminus ante quem* for the application of the 'land and sea' formula to Philip.

There is in fact good reason to think, with Niese¹—who based his deduction on the list of place-names preserved in Polyb. xiii. 10—that Philip carried out a campaign against the Odrysae in 204; and though in our present state of knowledge² it would be dangerous to exclude the possibility of other previous campaigns, the epigram certainly suggests a thorough defeat, which, if it had come a little earlier, might have been expected to render the 204 campaign unnecessary. Moreover, Philip attacked the Dardanians too in that year,³ which he was clearly devoting to intensive activity in the north before setting out for the Aegean and Asia Minor. There is thus at least a probability that the epigram refers to this year's expedition. And at this point it may be well to turn to the dedication itself.

As Glotz long ago observed,⁴ Philip's temple dedications reveal a combination of religious and political motives. A typical example from the early part of his reign is the dedication in the temple of Lindian Athena of spoils taken from the Dardanians and other northern peoples (Maedi or Paeonians?).⁵ The political aspect in turn reveals itself in two categories of dedications—those inside Macedon and Philip's adjacent possessions, directed, like a modern National Day of Prayer, towards the maintenance of a united purpose, and activity abroad, which linked up with foreign policy. Now a dedication implies the existence of a shrine and cult; a royal dedication signifies that these are of some importance.⁶ Thus the trophies of the bull slain by Philip on Mt. Orbelus were probably dedicated in the temple of Heracles at Beroea.⁷ Where, in view of these considerations, is Philip likely to have made his dedication to Hecate Einodia, and what, if any, will have been its significance? Unfortunately it is in the nature of the data available that our answer cannot be a statement of fact: the most one can do is to suggest possibilities.

Curiously, there is little evidence to connect Hecate with either Thrace or Macedon. Farnell suggested⁸ that Hecate was originally a Thracian goddess identified with Bendis, whose influence spread south through Thessaly to Boeotia and Aegina. If this were true, it might appear particularly appropriate for a victory over Thracians to be celebrated by a dedication to a primarily Thracian goddess. But as there are no recorded cults of Hecate in either Macedon or Thrace,⁹ Farnell's theory must be discarded in favour of that of Nilsson and Heckenbach,¹⁰ who claim that the bulk of

¹ *Gesch. der gr. u. mak. Staaten* (1899), ii. 571. Niese spoke of an *alliance* with the Odrysae, 'denn diese sind seitdem Freunde Makedoniens'. This reasoning does not exclude hostile contact in 204.

² Cf. *Philip V*, 259, n. 4.

³ Diod. xxviii. 2. 9. Cf. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques* (1921), 287, n. 3; Walbank, *op. cit.* 111, n. 8.

⁴ *REG*, xxix, 1916, 301; cf. *Philip V*, 268 f.

⁵ Timachidas, *Temple Chronicle*, ed. Blinkenberg, 337-8, No. XLII; for references see *Philip V*, 268, n. 6. A. Wilhelm reads *νικτορας* *Ἀφ[ρ]ῶ[ν]ος* *καὶ Μαίδας* or *Παλῶνας*.

⁶ Thus Philip's dedication to Enodia will hardly have been at the wayside shrine where Antiphilus of Byzantium dedicated his hat to that deity (and warned passers-by against the sacrilege involved in removing it): *Anth. Pal.* vi. 199.

⁷ Cf. Edson, *Harv. Stud.* xlv, 1934, 232; *ibid.* li, 1941, 125-6. The wild bull is dealt with in the three surviving epigrams of the Macedonian poet Samus; *Anth. Pal.* vi. 114-16.

⁸ *Cults of the Greek States*, ii (1896), 501-19; evidence and list of recorded cults, pp. 596-602, 606-7.

⁹ From Macedonia there is a dedication to *Eutychia Enodios Kotis* (*Revue des sociétés savantes*, 1858, 787, n. 27; quoted by Jessen in *P-W*, s.v. 'Enodia', col. 2635); but this is not the same thing as a dedication to Hecate. Further, W. Baegel, *De Macedonum sacris* (Diss. Philol. Halenses, xxii. 1; Halle, 1903) records two by no means certain references to Hecate in inscriptions from Citium (pp. 139-40) and Heraclea in Lyncestis (p. 143). For Thrace A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, ii. 2 (1925), index, s.v. 'Enhodia', suggests that the epithet found in a Thessalian inscription, *IG ix. 2. 575* (Larisa): *φαορικῆς* 'Enodias, may be connected with the Thracian tribe of the Astae; but this is unlikely. *I.G. ix. 2. 578*, in which Hecate is connected with the Polis (see below, p. 139, n. 4) supports the usual view that *φαορικῆς* is the adjective from *ἄορι*, as in *τὰ ἄορικὰ διονύσια* at Athens (Thucyd. v. 20); so L. and S.⁹, s.v. *δορικός*.

¹⁰ M. Nilsson, *Griech. Feste von religiöser*

the evid
home

If th
place fo
Enodia
are of co
and in p
exceptio
these m
a key po
attention
south th
services
cult of 2
been a n
an alter
gives a

The
Zeus—w
Strabo
our kno
south-w

Bedeutung
(1940), 19
cols. 2779
1920, 86,
originally
name 'Εκ
is Greek.
into centr
result of
foundation
name Hec
goddess o
of severa
(κῶμαι)
(p. 85). I
but it is
concerned
tioned) in
at the end

¹ The c
particular
42, with t
'Enodias' to
to Cook,
more than
of Enhod
drachm o
with a hea
internatio
1905, 175
in Dian.
with Heca
abroad to
(cf. Farn

the evidence points towards the Aegean and in particular Asia Minor as the original home of her cult.

If therefore Philip's dedication was made inside his own kingdom, the likeliest place for it was in Thessaly, where there is plenty of evidence for a strong cult of Enodia (though whether as an epithet of Artemis or of Hecate is not clear; the two are of course not always differentiated). Pherae,¹ Pagasae,² Pythium in Perrhaebia,³ and in particular Larisa⁴ all possessed cults of the goddess; and with the possible exception of Pherae, which was noted for its anti-Macedonian tradition,⁵ any one of these might have been the scene of Philip's dedication. Larisa, in particular, held a key position for the southern defences of Macedon, and Philip devoted considerable attention to the town early in his reign;⁶ moreover, as the first large place on the route south through Tempe and Thessaly, Larisa may have been expected to appreciate the services of the Macedonians in keeping the Balkan tribes pacified. Hence her triple cult of Zeus, Enodia, and the City (if it was instituted as early as this) would have been a not inappropriate object for Philip's attentions. Nevertheless, I wish to suggest an alternative hypothesis which, in view of our conclusions about *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518, gives a fuller content to the epigram.

The most famous cult of Hecate—a cult associated, as at Larisa, with that of Zeus—was at Lagina, a small town about 10 km. north-west of Stratonicea in Caria. Strabo testifies to its importance,⁷ and a series of inscriptions has recently enriched our knowledge of what is unquestionably one of the most important shrines in south-west Asia Minor,⁸ an area in which the worship of Hecate was especially

Bedeutung (1906), 394 f.; *Greek Popular Religion* (1940), 190; Heckenbach, *P.-W.*, s.v. 'Hekate', cols. 2779–82 (1912). J. Hatzfeld, *BCH*, xlv, 1920, 86, n. 1 contests the view that Hecate is originally Anatolian on the grounds that the name 'Εκάτη, like 'Εκατος, an epithet of Apollo, is Greek. He regards the introduction of her cult into central Caria as comparatively late and the result of Greek influences following on the foundation of Stratonicea in c. 265 B.C. The name Hecate was apparently given to a native goddess of Asiatic characteristics, who was one of several 'anciennes divinités des bourgades (κώμαι) de la confédération chrysaorienne' (p. 85). I would grant this argument some force, but it is not important here, since we are only concerned with the outstanding (and unquestioned) importance of the Carian cult of Hecate at the end of the third century.

¹ The cult of Artemis Enodia of Pherae was particularly widespread; cf. Polyæn. *Strat.* viii. 42, with the story of the sending of a *λέπεια τῆς 'Ενοδίας* to Asia Minor. This account, according to Cook, *Zeus*, iii. 1 (1940), 279, 'has borrowed more than one trait from the Thessalian cult of Enhodia'. Cook also mentions a silver drachm of Alexander of Pherae (369–357 B.C.) with a head of Hecate obv. (cf. Regling, *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique*, viii, 1905, 175 f.). This cult of Artemis (cf. Callim. in *Dian.* 259), who was sometimes identified with Hecate (cf. Schol. *Lycophron*, 1180), spread abroad to Sicyon, Argos, Athens, and Acarnania (cf. Farnell, op. cit. ii. 584, n. 117; 597, nn. 5–6).

Inscriptional evidence from Pherae, *IG* ix. 2. 421; *BCH*, xlviii, 1924, 482; cf. *JHS*, xlv, 1925, 224 f.

² *IG* ix. 2. 358: 'Ενοδίας πατρ[ώ]λαι (2nd cent. B.C.); cf. Regling, loc. cit.

³ *IG* ix. 2. 1286: ἐνοδίας πατρώαι Νικανδρίδης Ἀρμολίδου.

⁴ *IG* ix. 2. 575–7. 578: Μάκων Ὀμφαλιανὸς τὸν να[ὸν] Διὶ Μευλιχίῳ καὶ Ἐνοδίας καὶ Πό[λ]ει. Cf. Cook, *Zeus*, ii. 2. 1155. These inscriptions are unfortunately not dated.

⁵ Cf. Stählin, *Das hellenische Thessalien* (1924), 105, n. 1. In 198 Pherae closed its gate against Philip when he was carrying out a 'scorched earth' policy in Thessaly (Livy (Pol.), xxxii. 13. 9).

⁶ See Philip V, 35, 40, 69, n. 6, 296 f.; for Philip's two letters to Larisa (220 and 215 B.C.) see *Syll.*³ 543.

⁷ Strabo, xiv. 660. 25: ἐστὶ δ' ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Στρατονικέων δύο ἱερά, ἐν μὲν Λαγίνοις τὸ τῆς Ἐκάτης ἐπιφανέστατον πανηγύρεις μεγάλας συνάγον κατ' ἐπαυτὸν, ἐγγὺς δὲ τῆς πόλεως τὸ τοῦ Χρυσαιορέως Διὸς κοινὸν ἀπάντων Καρῶν κτλ.

⁸ See H. Oppermann, *Zeus Panamaros* (1924), 81: 'Zeus Panamaros und Hekate [waren] die höchsten Götter von Stratonikeia.' According to Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der gr. u. röm. Mythologie*, i (1884–90), col. 1885, the cult of Hecate at Stratonicea 'bildete den sakralen Mittelpunkt einer alten karischen Gauenossenschaft'. For the inscriptions see *BCH*, v, 1881, 185; ix, 1885, 437–74; xi, 1887, 5–39; 145–63; xlv, 1920, 70–100; li, 1927, 75, No. 15 b; 86,

domiciled.¹ It is in this shrine, I suggest, that Philip's dedication of Odrysian spoils may well have been made. That the cult of Lagina was already important by the end of the third century there can be little doubt. The temple which has been excavated is admittedly of later construction;² but the prevalence of Hecate-worship in Caria points to a cult of some antiquity, and Artemis Leucophryene of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander offers an excellent parallel of a cult which was seeking and obtaining grants of *asylia* from the main cities of the Greek world in the last decade of the third century, although her temple, the Artemision—the work, according to Vitruvius, of the noted Hermogenes—was not built until the same epoch as that of Hecate of Lagina, viz. about 130 B.C.³ Moreover, it is well known that in the year 201 Philip was paying special attention to the other important cult of Stratonicea, that of the Carian Zeus of Panamara. An inscription published in 1904⁴ shows him dedicating vases and a wine-vessel (*φιάλας και κάδον*) on his visit to the shrine—a detail which effectively dates the occasion to autumn–winter, 201. And should it be urged that a dedication of Balkan spoils was out of place in Asia Minor, the gifts from the Dardanian booty to Lindian Athena, already mentioned,⁵ successfully dispose of this objection.

In view of these considerations and of Philip's attested policy of courting popularity in the most important Greek temples, there is a prima-facie case for his having made his dedication to Hecate at Lagina. If, in addition, following the analogy of *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518, with its parallel formula of 'rule by land and sea', we date the dedication and the epigram to 201, the political background of Philip's action is apparent. As we saw, the Carian expedition of that year was directed primarily against Rhodes,⁶ and represented a determined effort to reverse the decision registered against Demetrius Poliorcetes a century before; its success or failure was therefore a matter vital to Philip's prestige. In fact, it proved highly successful. For four years Macedonian rule was maintained in Caria, and came to an end only with the Roman

No. 37; 92, No. 57; 94, No. 61; 97, No. 64; 100, No. 68; 101, No. 70; 102, No. 73; 111, No. 90 (= *SEG*, iv. 251 b, 282, 301–6, 323, 341); lviii, 1934, 336–7, No. 20. See further L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (1937), 546, 549, 551, 562, 570; and index under 'Lagina'.

¹ *CIG* 2796 refers to a priest of 'Ἐκάτη πρόπολις at Aphrodisias in Caria (3rd cent. B.C.?); 2897, a private dedication to Hecate from Heraclea in Latmos; 2715, 2720, 2727, and the references in the previous note for Lagina and Stratonicea (cf. *Tac. Ann.* iii. 62). According to Steph. Byz., pp. 326 M and 696 M (cf. Oppermann, op. cit., 6), the town of Idrias was originally called Hekatesia; and note the large number of names (e.g. Hecatomnus of Mylasa, the father of Mausolus) with Hecat- as a constituent part in this area and the Aegean (cf. Nilsson, *Griech. Feste*, 397, n. 3). For the cult-name of Hecate *Καπεή* cf. the extract from the *Keorol* of Julius Africanus, including an alleged portion of Homer's *Nekuia*, in *P. Ox.* 412 (Grenfell-Hunt, iii. 36; cf. Wunsch, *Archiv f. Relig.* xii, 1909, 2 f.). For general statements on Hecate in Caria see Farnell, op. cit. ii. 506, 606–7; Nilsson, op. cit., 397–8, 400–1 (Hekatesia or *Κλειδὸς πομπή* at Lagina); Heckenbach, *P-W*, s.v. 'Hekate', col. 2779. See above, p. 138, n. 10.

² On the date of its erection see L. Robert,

op. cit., 427, n. 2 (who puts it after the war with Mithridates, following J. Chamonard, *BCH*, xix, 1895, 260 f.); cf. 461 f., 552 f. It may, however, date somewhat earlier, to the years following the war with Aristonicus: so A. Schober, *Der Fries des Hekateions von Lagina* (Istanb. Forsch. ii, 1933), 16 f., 26; and M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941), ii. 824.

³ See Rostovtzeff, op. cit. ii. 820 (illustration), 824; iii. 1529, n. 100, who connects the two temples in style and period; on Hermogenes see Vitruvius, iii. 2. 3. On the inscriptions recording the request for and grants of *asylia*, towards the end of the third century, see E. Schlesinger, *Die griech. Asylie* (diss. Giessen, 1933), 59 f.; cf. L. Robert, *REA*, xxxviii, 1936, 13 f.

⁴ Cousin-Holleaux, *BCH*, xxviii, 1904, 346. 1; cf. Oppermann, op. cit. 18.

⁵ See above, p. 138, n. 5.

⁶ If the papyrus published in *P. Tebt.* 8 (Wilcken, *Chrestomathia*, 2; cf. Rostovtzeff, op. cit. 335) does in fact include Caria (*συναροσ(ρε)λαι* τοῖς ἀπὸ *Κα(π)ας*?) among the places from which various commodities are to be dispatched in Epiphanes' fourth year (202–201), then it must be assumed that Egypt still held a few coastal places. But Stratonicea is well inland and will scarcely have been Ptolemaic at this time.

victory
desirabl
dedicati
particul
of Str
possessi
as the c
exceptio
dedicati
viously

At t
Εὐρώπα
of Philip
signific
is of esp
Pal. xvi
as Dari

¹ For
tion unti
Cousin-H
354–5 (No
and 358–
1893, 53 f.
to 201 or
Ditt. *Syll.*

² On t
Griech. Ge
Meyer, *G*
(1925), 60
Gelder, p
of 197 v
recovery
possessam
18. 1), an
Stratonice
recipi is t
bius, xxx
obtained
τιόχου και
τοῦ). It is
are Soter
founded t
Antiochus
the beque
in c. 240.
first does
that 'Str
lag'; as in
μεχρι τῆς
where *κα*
editors to
avoid hie
19.) Othe
iv. 1. 15,
unconvinc
of the Ea

victory at Cynoscephalae.¹ In support of this object, however, it must have been desirable for Philip to win over the inhabitants of Caria as far as possible. The dedication at Panamara is undoubtedly part of such a campaign and shows Philip particularly concerned to gain popularity in the influential, centrally situated town of Stratonicea, which, until he seized it in 201, had been Rhodian.² As a Rhodian possession it demanded special measures if it was to be not only conquered but won: as the centre of two ancient and influential Carian cults it rendered such measures exceptionally fruitful. Among them, I would tentatively suggest, was Philip's dedication to Hecate of Lagina of the Odrysian spoils he had won three years previously and reserved for just such an occasion.

At this point we may examine the opening words of the epigram—*Κοίρανος Εὐρώπης*—which (if the above hypothesis is accepted) illuminate an important aspect of Philip's Carian propaganda. As a geographical expression, 'Europe' had originally signified Thrace³ and the central part of the Balkan peninsula, and in a passage which is of especial interest, since Alcaeus drew on it for his epigram on Flamininus (*Anth. Pal.* xvi. 5), Herodotus makes Xerxes speak of going *through Europe* against Hellas, as Darius had done before him.⁴ (Elsewhere, however, Herodotus uses 'Europe' in

¹ For the continuous Macedonian occupation until 197 see the inscriptions published by Cousin-Hollevaux, *BCH*, xxviii, 1904, 346 and 354-5 (No. 1); 346 and 356-8 (No. 2); and 347 and 358-9 (No. 3); the inscription *BCH*, xvii, 1893, 53 f. (= *Études d'épigr.* i. 411-15) may refer to 201 or 197. Cf. Livy (Pol.), xxxiii. 18. 3 f.; Ditt. *Syll.*³ 586. See Philip V, 175, n. 3.

² On this vexed point I agree with Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* iv. 2. (1927), 541, n. 1, and Ernst Meyer, *Grenzen der hell. Staaten in Kleinasien* (1925), 60, who, following Droysen and Van Gelder, point out that the Rhodian campaign of 197 was specifically concerned with the recovery of the *regionem—Peraeam vocant—possessam maioribus suis* (Livy (Pol.), xxxiii. 18. 1), and that the centre of the attack was Stratonicea, in connexion with which the word *recipi* is twice used (Livy, §§ 19 and 22). Polybius, xxx. 31. 6 records how the Rhodians obtained Stratonicea *ἐν μεγάλῃ χάριτι παρ' Ἀντιόχου καὶ Σελεύκου* (for καὶ Niebuhr suggested τοῦ). It is unlikely that Antiochus and Seleucus are Soter and his fellow-regent, for Seleucus had founded the town. Beloch suggests they are Antiochus Hierax and Seleucus III, and dates the bequest to the end of the war with Ptolemy in c. 240. (The fact that Antiochus is mentioned first does not, however, justify his conclusion that 'Stratonikeia in Antiochos' Reichsteile lag'; as in the similar example, Polyb. ii. 41. 6: *μέχρι τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Φιλίππου δυναστείας*—where καὶ has similarly been emended by some editors to τοῦ—the order is simply designed to avoid hiatus; cf. Aymard, *REA*, xxxix, 1937, 19.) Other views are those of De Sanctis, op. cit. iv. 1. 15, n. 41; cf. 89, n. 170 (uncertain, but unconvinced by Beloch); A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937), 50, 388,

n. 34 (following Beloch); Ruge, *P-W*, s.v. 'Stratonikeia', cols. 322-3 (Polyb. xxx. 31. 6 refers to Antiochus III: since the region attacked was *possessam maioribus suis*, it must have been lost to Rhodes long before 201—a fallacious argument since (a) the area in question (the Peraea) is *known* to have been mainly lost in 201, (b) Livy only says it was *possessam*, not *amissam*, *maioribus suis*); Niese, op. cit. ii. 587 (Stratonicea Ptolemaic in 201); Hollevaux could not make up his mind: *BCH*, xvii, 1893, 58, n. 2 (Droysen's (i.e. Beloch's) view provisionally accepted); *BCH*, xxviii, 1904, 353, n. 2, and *REA*, xxiii, 1921, 209 f. (Stratonicea Seleucid in 201); *CAH*, viii. 155 (perhaps Rhodian, probably independent).

³ See Escher, *P-W*, s.v. 'Europa', cols. 1287-98; Berger, *ibid.*, cols. 1298-1309. In the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*, 71 f., 111 f., Europe is contrasted with the islands and Peloponnese; and mythology made Thrake and Europa sisters (Escher, loc. cit.).

⁴ With lines 3-4:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Εὐρώπῃ δουλὸν ζυγὸν αὐτῇ θήσω
ἦλθεν· ὁ δ' ἄμπαύσαν Ἑλλάδα δουλοσύνας
compare Herod. vii. 8, β, 1: μέλλω ζεύξας τὸν Ἑλλησποντον ἐλὼν στρατὸν διὰ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα . . . 8, γ, 1-3: Once we have defeated Athens and her neighbours οἱ Πέλοπος τοῦ Φρυγὸς νέμονται χώραν, γῆν τὴν Πελοίδα ἀποδέξομεν τῷ Διὸς αἰθέρι ὁμοῦρέουσιν. οὐ γὰρ δὴ χώραν γε οὐδεμίαν κατόψεται ἥλιος ὁμοῦρέουσιν τῇ ἡμετέρῃ, ἀλλὰ σφέας πάσας ἐγὼ ἅμα ὑμῖν μίαν χώραν θήσω, διὰ πάσης διεξελθὼν τῆς Εὐρώπης. . . . All other peoples are negligible once the Greeks are conquered . . . οὕτω οἱ τε ἡμῖν αἰτίοι ἔξουσι δουλίον ζυγὸν οἱ τε ἀνάτιοι. Cf. Herod. vi. 43: Darius' force διαβάντες τῇσι νηυσὶ τὸν Ἑλλησποντον ἐπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Εὐρώπης, ἐπορεύοντο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν καὶ Ἀθήνας.

the later sense of the whole continent.)¹ During the fourth century, after the Peace of Antalcidas, the conception of 'Europe' began to play a large part in the Isocratean propaganda, and was developed as a political slogan, which contrasted Europe and Asia along lines parallel to the ancient antithesis of Greek and barbarian. In this context, as Momigliano has shown,² 'Europe' was something greater than 'Hellas'; it included the Balkans, and might become the slogan for either a Balkan or an anti-Persian policy under the leadership of the Macedonian dynasty. Philip II was probably using it in the second sense when he named his daughter by Cleopatra, born in 336, Europa.³ Recently Momigliano has pointed out⁴ the influence of this political conception of Europe on Philip V, who inherited it along with his passion for his 'ancestor' Philip II, and his predilection for the works of Theopompus;⁵ an echo of it survives in the words *κοίρανος Εὐρώπας*, which when used in relation to Philip (with his consent) must, it is alleged, imply a challenge to Rome.

This last suggestion requires careful consideration. That the word 'Europe' has here a political flavour will, I think, be generally conceded; but that flavour is not necessarily anti-Roman. A glance at those passages of Polybius and of Livy, where Polybius is his source, which use 'Europe' in a political sense, shows that in the middle of the second century the essence of 'Europe' was not what it included, but what it excluded—namely, Asia.⁶ Europe from this point of view was roughly the central and eastern part of the Mediterranean, west and north of the Hellespont: and the overwhelming majority of instances deal with the question of Antiochus' crossing that boundary from Asia.⁷ Now it was in the course of the Romano-Syrian negotiations preceding the war with Antiochus that the conception of a Roman sphere in Europe contrasted with the Seleucid sphere in Asia became formulated: since Cynoscephalae the Romans had been virtually supreme in Greece, and it is natural that when the fourth-century antithesis between Europe and Asia reappears in second-century diplomacy, it is bound up with the question of Roman predominance in Europe. 'Europe' is now synonymous with the Roman sphere of influence.

But what is true after 197 is not necessarily true before that date. Unless it is assumed that the Senate was already anticipating the lines of subsequent expansion (which has not yet been proved, and which I do not believe),⁸ before the outbreak of the Second Macedonian War it was still possible for a King of Macedon to call himself (or be called) *κοίρανος Εὐρώπας* without more than a backward glance at his recent enemy.⁹

¹ e.g. iv. 45, 49.

² *Riv. Fil.* lxi, 1933, 477-87: 'L'Europa come concetto politico presso Isocrate e gli Isocratei'; cf. *Filippo il Macedone* (1934), 161.

³ Athen. xiii, p. 557e (cf. Justin. ix. 7. 12; whereas Diod. xvii. 2. 3 speaks of *παῖδός*); cf. Momigliano, *Riv. Fil.* lxi, 1933, 487, n. 1: 'Voleva Filippo, alla vigilia della nuova impresa in Asia, consacrare il dominio ormai raggiunto in Europa?'; *Filippo*, 166, n. 2.

⁴ *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, 56-7.

⁵ Cf. *Philip V*, 258, n. 3. Theopompus had called Philip II the greatest man Europe had ever seen (*Fr. gr. Hist.* 115 F. 27; cf. F. 256).

⁶ From the Greek point of view, which is what immediately concerns us. A Roman like Ennius might formulate a different contrast: *Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda* (*Annales*, 302 Vahlen², ix. 3)—later to be expressed by Virgil in Dido's dying curse (*Aeneid*, iv. 628-9). But the claim to represent Europe in a struggle

against the African Carthaginians is of course not equivalent to a claim to dominate Europe.

⁷ Such passages, where the significance of 'Europe' is political, and not merely geographical, are e.g. Polyb. i. 2. 4; 2. 6; iii. 3. 4; xviii. 44. 2; 45. 4; 46. 15; Livy, xxxi. 1. 7; xxxiii. 13. 15; 30. 2; 31. 6; 34. 4; 39. 7; 40. 4; 44. 7; xxxiv. 33. 12; 43. 4; 58. 2-3; 59. 5; 60. 6; xxxv. 12. 2; 18. 3; 32. 14; 35. 7; 42. 2; 46. 6 and 9; 48. 3 and 4; 48. 7; xxxvi. 3. 12; 7. 10; 17. 7; xxxvii. 9. 8; 35. 2-3; 35. 5; 45. 13; 52. 4; 53. 13; 54. 11; xxxviii. 10. 6; 38. 3; 40. 3; 59. 4; xlii. 29. 1; 52. 14; xlv. 9. 2. (In Polyb. iii. 37. 2 f.; xxxiv. 5 f. 'Europe' has a purely geographical sense.)

⁸ For the view that there was an abrupt change in Roman policy in 201 see Holleaux, *Rome, etc., passim*, and particularly the summary, 332 f.

⁹ The force of the phrase is strengthened if, as Dr. Treves has suggested to me, *κοίρανος* is a Hellenistic resuscitation of a word for 'king'

As in
the que
the dec
which
only re
liminar
the out
and wo
to be c
a 'Lord
ander,
pay ovr
της προ
of Alex
subsequ
Asia Mi
giants o
more) b
of north
Europe

On
will be
in the s

peculiar
Momiglia
'Caranus'
notewort
Graec. 10

¹ This
in Livy,
chus as ru
42. 10: 'i
Manlium
alterum i
tiocho su

² See a

³ On th
König d.
Würzburg
Gonatas (1
(1938), 40
History, ii
teristics o
G. Daux,
l'abaisseme
191-31 av.
270 f.; it
point to th
against P
of Daux,
18. 1-2; I

⁴ Polyb
Philip II's
Adriatic t

⁵ Livy

As in the fourth century, 'Europe' implied a contrast with 'Asia'¹—rather than the question of hegemony within the continent. And the flattering phrase with which the dedication to Hecate opens was intended not to challenge Rome in a sphere which she could not claim as exclusively hers until after Cynoscephalae, and which only reassumed its position in the realm of political controversy during the preliminaries to the Syrian War, but (if I may adapt Momigliano's words)² to establish on the outset of Philip's new undertaking in Asia the *κοιρανία* already won in Europe—and won moreover against the barbarian whom it was the historical task of Macedon to be constantly repelling from the northern frontiers of Greece.³ In short, it was as a 'Lord of Europe' that Philip, like so many Macedonian kings before him—Alexander, Antigonos, Poliorcetes, Doson—sailed against Asia; court flattery need not pay overmuch attention to the fact that this Europe was *βραχὺ παντελῶς . . . μέρος τῆς προειρημένης χώρας*⁴—just as in 171 Perseus was to speak in boastful exaggeration of Alexander's invasion of Asia *Europa omni domita*.⁵ And, as Eumenes II was subsequently to celebrate his Hellenic victory over the barbarous Galatians of Asia Minor by his erection of the famous frieze depicting the contest of gods and giants on the Great Altar at Pergamum, so Philip—with perhaps a glance (but no more) backwards at the barbarians from Italy—may have sought by his dedication of northern spoils at Lindus and Lagina to emphasize his own comparable role in Europe.⁶

On this hypothesis, the date of the dedication and of the epigram celebrating it will be 201–200. It is hardly likely to have been later, when Philip had become embroiled in the second conflict with Rome; and, on the other hand, anything earlier seems

peculiar to north Greece and Macedonia; cf. Momigliano, *Atene e Roma*, xii, 1931, 208–10, on 'Caranus' as a title for Macedonian kings. It is noteworthy that according to Bekker, *Anecd. Graec.* 1095, the Boeotian for 'king' was *κόλπας*.

¹ This shows clearly in an annalistic passage in Livy, which also contrasts Philip and Antiochus as rulers of Europe and Asia: Livy, xxxviii. 42. 10: 'indignum esse . . . M. Fulvium et Cn. Manlium biennium iam, alterum in Europa, alterum in Asia, velut pro Philippo atque Antiocho substitutos regnare.'

² See above, p. 142, n. 3.

³ On this see W. Fellmann, *Antigonos Gonatas, König d. Makedonen, u. die griech. Staaten* (diss. Würzburg, 1930), 40; W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (1913), 202; *Greeks in Bactria and India* (1938), 409 (quoting A. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, ii² (1935), 112–208, on the special characteristics of such a 'march state' as Macedon); G. Daux, *Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle depuis l'abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine*, 191–31 av. J.-C. (1936), 321; Walbank, *Philip V*, 270 f.; it is this tradition which lends special point to the charges of barbarization later brought against Perseus (cf. *F.D.* iii. 4. 75 with the notes of Daux, loc. cit.; Polyb. xxv. 6; App. *Maced.* 18. 1–2; Diod. xxx. 19).

⁴ Polyb. i. 2. 4: on the Macedonians of Philip II's time, who *τῆς Εὐρώπης ἤρξαν* from the Adriatic to the Danube.

⁵ Livy (Pol.), xlii. 52. 14. The phrase is inter-

esting as showing what Polybius expected a Macedonian king to say; that it represents neither Polybius' nor Livy's personal view of Alexander's position in Europe is clear from Polyb. i. 2. 4 (see previous note), and from Livy, ix. 16. 19 (Alexander's probable fate at the hands of Papirius Cursor, *si arma Asia perdomita in Europam vertisset*).

⁶ It is perhaps not fanciful to see another reason for a dedication to Hecate at this moment, and for the poet's linking of it with the 'land and sea' formula. In the much discussed passage of Hesiod's *Theogony* dealing with Hecate, the goddess's functions are defined (lines 411–14):

ἡ δ' (i.e. Asteria) ὀνοκυσσάμενη Ἑκάτην τέκε, τὴν
περὶ πάντων

Ζεὺς Κρονίδης τίμησε. πόρην δέ οἱ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα,
μοῖραν ἔχειν γαίης τε καὶ ἀπρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης,
ἡ δὲ καὶ ἀστερόεντος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἔμμορε τιμῆς.

Whatever view one takes of the origin of this passage and the strains of thought it contains (see O. Kern, *Röm. Mitt.* I, 1925, 157; K. Pfister, *Philol.* lxxxiv, 1929, 1 f.; Wilamowitz, *Glaube der Hellenen*, i (1931), 172), there can be no doubt that the literary conception of Hecate thus established was not without later influence. The infernal aspects of Hecate, writes Farnell (op. cit. ii. 514), 'never . . . altogether obscured the earlier Hesiodic conception of a Hekate powerful on land and sea, and beneficent to men in certain parts of life'.

ruled out. For, in the first place, as I have shown elsewhere,¹ there were no direct relations between Caria and Macedon from the end of Doson's reign until Philip's eastern policy towards the end of the century; and the cult of Hecate of Lagina, though important in and for Caria, had not the international fame enjoyed by Lindian Athena or Artemis Leucophryene since the establishment of her new festival. Hence the epigram will be contemporary with that of Alcaeus already discussed (*Anth. Pal.* ix. 518), and will relate Philip's successes in Asia Minor to those already achieved in the Balkans, with a view to winning over the Greeks of Caria to whole-hearted support of the new lord of Hellas.² Like Alcaeus' epigram, to which it is further linked by the reference to *θείων . . . ἐρόνων* in line 6, it will fit in with Philip's contemporary dedications in Delos, with their claim to victories by land and sea; and it will offer some further indication of the kind of argument the Rhodians brought to Rome in the autumn of 201.³ In particular it will reinforce Griffith's contention⁴ that fear of a revived Macedonian naval power constituted one of the main factors which brought about the momentous and notorious change in Roman policy towards Macedon at that time.

However, short of the discovery of a dedicatory inscription at Lagina, this hypothesis is not susceptible of rigorous proof; and a dedication somewhere in Thessaly, where the cult-name of Enodia is prevalent, should not be ruled out.⁵ In either case, the date of the epigram will be earlier than the Second Macedonian War. Moreover, although the examination of this poem was essential both in view of its close parallelism of theme with *Anth. Pal.* ix. 518, and in order to establish what conclusions it will legitimately allow, it does not necessarily affect our main consideration—the examination of Alcaeus' work—since it remains only a possibility, and no more, that he is its author.

Many guesses have in fact been hazarded as to its authorship. Some scholars have attributed it to Alcaeus,⁶ and Dübner to Antipater of Sidon.⁷ Hecker suggested⁸ that it was the work of Samus, the Macedonian court-poet and *σύντροφος* of Philip, from whose pen came the three poems celebrating the dedication of spoils from a wild bull in the temple of Heracles at Beroea.⁹ Certainly the comparison of Philip with Zeus recalls Samus' parody of Euripides (*Supplic.* 860), which the Macedonians scrawled on the smoking walls of Thermum in 218, and which gained half its point from the fact that in it Philip was made to play the role of Zeus.¹⁰ On this occasion the Macedonian king appears to have appreciated both the jest and the compliment; and his pleasure in the kind of learned flattery which identified him with the king of the Olympians appears again later in his own gesture of naming his son by an Argive

¹ In a forthcoming paper in *JHS*, 'Olympichus of Alinda and the Carian expedition of Antigonos Doson'.

² It is worth noting that Stratonicea was a Seleucid, i.e. Greco-Macedonian, foundation in the middle of a non-Greek population (cf. Strabo, xiv. 660; Steph. Byz. *Στρατονικεία, πόλις Μακεδόνων πλησίον Καρίας*); its position is emphasized by the 'back-stairs' method which alone enabled it to obtain representation in the native *σύστημα Χρυσαιοπέων* (Strabo, xiv. 660 c; cf. Oppermann, op. cit. 6 f.; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, ii. 1 (1925), 714, n. 6).

³ Cf. *Philip V*, 127 f., 310 f.

⁴ G. T. Griffith, *Camb. Hist. Journ.* v, 1935, 1-14: 'An early motive of Roman imperialism (201 B.C.).'

⁵ The case for Thessaly is considerably strengthened, of course, if one rejects Hecker's emendation of the first line of the epigram, thus making the dedication one to *Εἰνοδία* alone (as in *Anth. Pal.* vi. 199); see above, p. 137, n. 6.

⁶ e.g. Bergk, *Poet. lyr. graec.* 4 iii. 196; Geffcken, *P-W*, s.v. 'Samos (2)', col. 2161; contra Stadtmüller, ed. Teubner, ad ix. 518.

⁷ Didot ed., ad loc.

⁸ A. Hecker, *Comment. crit. de Anth. Gr.* (Leiden, 1852) i. 76.

⁹ See above, p. 138, n. 7.

¹⁰ Polyb. v. 9. 5: *ὅρως τὸ δῖον οὐ βέλος διέπτατο*; it was the reply to the Aetolian sacrilege at Dium in Macedonia—but *δῖον βέλος* can also be 'the avenging bolt of Zeus'. See Dow and Edson, *Harv. Stud.* xlviii, 1937, 156.

mother Perseus, after Zeus' Argive son!¹ However, this kind of mythological allusion is a commonplace of the Hellenistic kingdoms,² and Momigliano has quoted a number of examples showing how naturally the comparison with Zeus developed out of the attribution of lordship by land and sea.³ Accordingly it is best to leave the question of authorship open, concluding simply that the epigram was the work of someone in close touch with the court at Pella, who probably wrote it as a contribution to Philip's political programme at the time of the Carian expedition.

¹ On this see Tarn, *JRS*, xxxi, 1941, 173. Whether the name Perseus necessarily denotes illegitimacy is, I think, a moot point. It may be observed here that Philip's stress on his identity with Zeus may have something to do with the form under which Flamininus was saluted when he followed the Roman garrison from Acrocorinth in 194. Following good Hellenistic precedent, Flamininus was regularly acclaimed 'Soter' (e.g. Plut. *Flam.* 10. 6: τὸν σωτήρα τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ πρύμαρχον; Syll.³, 592, inscription from Gytheum, hailing him σωτήρα; S. B. Kougeas, *Ἑλληνικά*, i, 1928, 7 (cf. *Année Épigraphique*, 1929, 24 f., No. 99; S. Eitrem, *Symbolae Osloenses*, x, 1932, 43) dealing with the *Κασιόπεια* festival and the cult of Flamininus at Gytheum; Plut. *Flam.* 16. 3 f.: cult at Chalcis and hymn ending ὦ Τίτε σῶτρε); but on this occasion the crowd hailed him *servatorem liberatoremque* (Livy (Pol.) xxxiv. 50. 9), that is σωτήρα καὶ ἐλευθέριον, the cult-titles under which Zeus was worshipped at Athens and Plataea for his help at the time of the Persian Wars (see Jessen, *P-W*, s.v. 'Eleutherios (1)', cols. 2348-50, for the evidence; cf. Wade-Gery, *JHS*, liii, 1933, 90-1). Since not only Alcaeus' comparison between Flam. and Xerxes (see forthcoming vol. xxxvii, p. 9, n. 9), but also a passage in Plut. *Flam.* 11 (which may well go back to contemporary Roman propaganda) links the Persian and Second Macedonian Wars as notable struggles for the liberty of Greece, it seems likely that the comparison between Flamininus and Zeus Soter and Eleutherios was intentional, if not actually stage managed (Flamininus' speech had offered some fairly clear hints: Livy (Pol.) xxxiv. 49). Thus Flamininus was able to appropriate his late opponent's pretensions, and at the same time consign him to the ranks of the very

barbarians against whom Philip was so proud to have fought!

² Dow and Edson, *op. cit.* 157, quote a number of examples, including that of Antigonos Gonatas and Sostratus of Cnidos, Ptolemy II's ambassador to Pella, who, when he suspected that his mission was about to fail, quoted a passage from Homer (*Iliad*, xv. 201-3), which implied that though his victory at Cos had made Gonatas master of the sea, like Poseidon, Ptolemy still had the role of Zeus (Sext. Empir. *adv. grammaticos*, 276 (ed. Bekker, 662); cf. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 387).

³ *JRS*, xxxii, 1942, p. 64, n. 45. A remarkable example of this kind of mythological allusion is the passage of Eusebius (Schöne, i. 238)—cf. Tarn, *Athenian Stud. pres. to W. S. Ferguson* (1940), 494 f.—which elaborates an involved comparison between Chryseis the mother of Philip and Chryseis in the *Iliad*, both of whom bring a double disaster on the Greeks at the hands of the Trojans or their Roman descendants; the origin of this story may go back to this period, which saw the production of Lycophron's *Alexandra*, with its indication of Flamininus as the ultimate heir to the destiny of Troy (following Ziegler's date of c. 196, in *P-W*, s.v. 'Lykophron (8)', cols. 2316-81, against the earlier, traditional date now proposed again by Momigliano), and which encouraged that attitude towards the Macedonian kingdom during its struggles with Rome, the favoured of Heaven, which is reflected in the treatment which Polybius accords to Philip V, as a tragic figure whose outrages *Tyche* avenges by driving him on to an anti-Roman policy, which eventually involves his whole house in ruin (cf. *JHS*, lviii, 1938, 55-68; to the references there given add Polyb. xxix. 27. 11-12).

[To be continued]

INDEXES

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome, 134 ff.
Apocolocyntosis, the, reconsidered, 83.
ἀπουσία, growth of the Greek, 94.
- Camillus and Concord, 111 ff.
 Catullus, chronology of the poems of, 79.
 Colchester, L. S., justice and death in Sophocles, 21.
- Di Novensides* and *Di Indigetes*, 43.
- Ennius, direct citation in Virgil, 40.
- Fraenkel, Eduard, the stars in the prologue of the
Rudens, 10; an epodic poem of Hipponax, 54.
- Goldmann, E., *Di Novensides* and *Di Indigetes*, 43.
- Gow, A. S. F., Theocritus, *Idyll XXIV—Stars and Doors*, 104 ff.
- Hackforth, R., Plato's divided line and dialectic, 1.
- Henderson, M. L., the growth of the Greek *ἀπουσία*, 94.
 Hipponactem, *Commentarii* in (P. Oxy. 2176¹, fragm. 6), 133.
 Hipponax, an epodic poem of, 54.
- Ismenias, 57.
- Maas, P., the chronology of the poems of Catullus, 79;
Commentarii in Hipponactem (P. Oxy. 2176¹, fragm. 6), 133.
 Meno of Pharsalus, 57.
- Momigliano, A., Camillus and Concord, 111 ff.
- Morrison, J. S., Meno of Pharsalus, Polycrates, and Ismenias, 57.
- Nero *artifex*: the *Apocolocyntosis* reconsidered, 83.
- Once more 'Macte', 15.
 Onomatopoeia and the sceptics, 121 ff.
- Plato's divided line and dialectic, 1.
 Polycrates, 57.
- Richardson, L. J. D., direct citation of Ennius in Virgil, 40.
- Rose, H. J., once more 'Macte', 15.
Rudens, the stars in the prologue of the, 10.
- Sense and sound in Classical poetry, 29.
- Skutsch, O., once more 'Macte', 15.
 Sophocles, justice and death in, 21.
- Theocritus, *Idyll XXIV—Stars and Doors*, 104 ff.
- Todd, O. J., sense and sound in Classical poetry, 29.
- Toynbee, J. M. C., Nero *artifex*: the *Apocolocyntosis* reconsidered, 83.
- Virgil, direct citation of Ennius in, 40.
- Walbank, F. W., Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome, 134 ff.
- Wilkinson, L. P., onomatopoeia and the sceptics, 121 ff.

II. INDEX OF PASSAGES

- Ad Polyb.*:
 xiii (1), 84.
- Aeschylus:
Agam. (820), 130.
Cho. (511), 32.
P.V. (937-43), 36 f.; (965), 38; (966 f.), (972 f.), (975 f.), (979), (987 f.), 37; (1000), (1014), (1021), 38.
- Alcaeus:
Anth. Pal. xvi. 5 (3-4), 141.
- Anth. Pal.*:
 vi (171), 135; ix (518), 134; (526), 135; (xvi), 137.
- Apuleius:
Met. ii (2), 46.
- Archippus:
 (fr. 35, 3 K.), 54.
- Aristides:
 57 (18), 96.
- Aristophanes:
Birds (1164 f.), 33.
Clouds (250 ff.), (254), (263), 25; (741-2), 8;
 (967-8), 94.
Peace (832 f.), 11.
Thesm. (845), 33.
Wasps (1271), 64.
- Aristotle:
'Aθ. Πολ. (56), 25.
de mundo 4 (394b 13), 52.
Met. (987b 14), (1059b 6), 1.
Poet. (1450a 1), 68.
Pol. (1253a 18), 118; (1261b 6), 68.
- Arnobius:
 i (86), 49; iii (38), 44.
- Auct.
ad Alexandrum (1444b 29 f.), (1445b 22 f.), 33.
ad Herennium iv (18), 30, 32; (32), 30.
- Calpurnius Siculus:
Bucol. vii (83), 90.
- Cato:
 i (134), 16; (139), (141), 17.
- Catullus:
 11 (17), 81; 31 (9-11), 80; 36 (18), 37 (11, 12, 14), 81; 68 (16), (34), 80; (148), 82.
- Cicero:
ad Att. i (3), 18.
Brutus 14 (54), 118.
de Divinat. i (17 ff.), 18.
de Sen. (55), 31.
Orat. (149), 31; (150), 30; (163), 29, 30 f.
pro Cael. (38), 81.
pro Mil. (30), 31.
pro Sest. (48), 31.
- C.I.L.:
 iii (1129), (3116), 46; v (3106), 46; ix (4644), 46;
 x (4734), 46; x (5779), 51; xi (6297), 45; xiii (6649), 46.
- [Cyprian]:
De spect. (5), 19.
- Demosthenes:
 ix (43), (44), 33; xiv (30), 68; xix (95), 54.

Dessau, I.
 Dio:
 lxi (1)
 Diodorus:
 xiv (1)
 Diogenes:
 ix (48)
 Diomedes:
 (p. 47)
 Dionysius:
 de cor
 Ditt. Or.
 54 (4)

Ennius:
 v. pp.
 Eubulus:
 Diomy
 (frg. 1)
 Eupolis:
 (fr. 20)
 Euripides:
 Bacch
 Ion (2)
 Iph. 2
 Med.
 Melan
 Phaeth
 Tro. (1)
 frag. 3

Grattius:
 Cynege

Heraclides
 v. pp.
 Herodes:
 (6), 70
 (30)
 Herodotus:
 vi (43)
 Hesiod:
 Erga (1)
 Theog.
 Hipponax:
 P. Oxy
 Homer:
 Il. i (1)
 34; v
 xxii
 Od. v (1)
 Horace:
 Carm.
 Epist. i
 Epod. x
 Odes i.
 130;
 137-1
 132;
 Sat. ii.
 Hyperides:
 pro Eux

Inscr. Graec.
 ix (2, 5)
 Isocrates:
 Bus. i (1)
 Philip (1)

Livy:
 i. 11 (2)
 i (9)
 xxxv

Lucan:
 Phars.
 4590-7

- Dessau, *ILS* (52), 115.
Dio:
 lxi (19-21), 89.
Diodorus:
 xlv (13), 73; xv. 35 (3), 112.
Diogenes Laertius:
 ix (48), 130.
Diomedes:
 (p. 476. 17), 52.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus: vi. 83 (2), 118.
 de comp. verb. (15), (16), 122.
Ditt. *Or. Gr. Inscr.*:
 54 (4), 107.
Ennius:
 v. pp. 51, 52, 142.
Eubulus:
 Dionys. (frg. 27 K.), 35.
 (frg. 134 K.), 36.
Eupolis:
 (fr. 209 K.), 64.
Euripides:
 Bacchae (1065), 127.
 Ion (294), 70; (1153), 104.
 Iph. Taur. (765), 34.
 Med. (476), 35.
 Melanippe (506 N.²), 11.
 Phaethon (fr. 773 N.²), 96.
 Tro. (774-5), 126.
 frag. 360 (14) (N.²), 33.
Grattius:
 Cyneg. (436), 46.
Heraclides Ponticus:
 v. pp. 95, 100.
Herodes:
 (6), 70; (10), (11), (18), 68; (19), 74; (22-3), 69;
 (30), 68 f.; (32), 68; (33), 69.
Herodotus:
 vi (43), 141; vii (88, 1), (89, 1-3), 141.
Hesiod:
 Erga (122 ff.), 10; (249 ff.), 11.
 Theog. (411-14), 143.
Hipponax:
 P. Oxy. 2176^t (fragm. 6), 133.
Homer:
 Il. i (179 f.), 34; iv (125), 132; vi (269 f.), (484),
 34; viii (69), 32; xviii (487), 104; xix (189), 31;
 xxii (209), 32.
 Od. v (273), 104; xxi (47), 110.
Horace:
 Carm. saec. (29), 51.
 Epist. i. 2 (42), 132.
 Epod. xi (20), xv (9), 131; xvi (47-8), 129.
 Odes i. 3 (29-33), 132; i. 11 (5), 131; i. 28 (1-4),
 130; i. 35 (13-16), 131; ii. 2 (15-18), 130; ii. 3
 (17-19), 132; iii. 13 (14-16), 129; iv. 1 (35-6),
 132; iv. 2 (45-8), 131.
 Sat. ii. 6 (16), 131.
Hyperides:
 pro Eux. xxv (12 f.), 33.
Inscr. *Graec.*:
 ix (2, 575-7, 578), (2, 1286), 139.
Isocrates:
 Bus. i (221a), v (222d), (hypothesis), 77.
 Philip (132), 136.
Livy:
 i. 11 (2), 120; v. 49 (3), 113; vi. 42 (11), 120; vii.
 1 (9), 111; 15 (12), 114; xxvi. 23 (4), 116;
 xxxviii. 42 (10), 143; xli. 16 (1), 18 f.
Lucan:
 Phars. i (48-50), (61-2), (66), 90.
 4599-7
Lucretius:
 v (993), 31.
Lysias:
 in Andoc. (10), 27.
 Epit. ii (18), 119.
Marius Victorinus:
 K. vi (9. 17 ff.), 48.
Martianus Capella:
 i (45 ff.), 47.
Menander:
 frg. 301 (6) K., 33.
Ovid:
 Fast. i (641), 115; iv (759), 52.
 Mel. i (262-73), 125 f.; (343-7), 125; ii (238), 52;
 (319-22), 125; vi (378), 125; xv (878 f.), 31.
Philemon:
 Avp (fr. 91 K.), 13.
Pindar:
 Nem. i (61-3), iii (23-6), 136.
 Ol. xiii (97), 68.
Plato:
 Epinomis (981 E), (983 E), (984 D ff.), 14.
 Leg. (805 A), (845 D), 33.
 Meno (70 B), 75.
 Phaedo (107 B), 8; (108 A), 25.
 Phaedr. (250 C), 25, 26; (251 A), 25.
 Phil. (26 E), 33.
 Pol. (258 C), (291 C), 8; (293 E), 33.
 Protag. (339 A), 8.
 Rep. (454 A), 5; (485 B), 5 f.; (486 A), 6; (505 A),
 7; (511 B), 3, 4; (511 C, D), 3; (527 B), 4;
 (531 A-C), 93; (532 D), 5; (533 C), 6; (534 B), 5.
 Symp. (204 A), 7.
 Theaet. (151 A), 33.
 Tim. (68 E), 9, 33.
Plato Comicus:
 Eopral (frg. 30 K.), 34.
Plautus:
 Bacch. (434), 15.
 Merc. (678), 46.
 Poen. (198), 15.
 Rudens (9 ff.), (66 ff.), 10; (698), 46.
Pliny:
 Paneg. (11), 91.
Plutarch:
 Camillus (22), 113; (42), 115.
 De Profect. Virt. (81 E), 25.
 Flam. (10. 6), 145.
 Lys. (13), 73.
 Mor. (41 D), 39.
 Quaesi. Conviv. ix. 15 (2), 122.
Polybius:
 i. 2 (4), 143; ii. 41 (6), 141; v. 9 (5), 144; xxx. 31
 (6), 141.
Proclus:
 in Eucl. I (p. 255, 8 Fr.), 8.
Ps.-Plutarch:
 de Musica (11), 102.
Quintilian:
 Inst. Orat. viii. iii (50 f.), 30; ix. iv (41), 30; xii.
 x (29), 29.
Scholiasts:
 V ad Aristoph. Nub. (741-2), 8.
 ad Hom. Il. iv (125), 132.
 ad Hom. Od. xi (271), 27 f.
 ad Pind. Pyth. iv (246), 69.
 ad Soph. O.C. (960), 22; (1590), 28.
Seneca:
 Apocol. (1), 91; (4), 86; (8), 83, 92 f.; (12), 83.
 de Clem. i (iv), 86; (viii. 4), (x. 3), 84.

Servius:

ad Aen. iii (183), 31; ix (641), 17.

Silius Italicus:

xvii (326 f.), 31.

Sophocles:

Ajax (687 ff.), 32.

Antig. (739), (742), (746), (756), (767), (780), (997), (1052), 38.

El. (1424), 22.

O.C. (89), (100), (131), (195), (480), (624), (1052), (1651-2), 26.

O.T. (371), 32, 121; (425), 38; (1261), 107; (1262), 32; (1329), 22.

Phil. (177), (191), 21; (451), 22.

Trach. (1276), 22.

Strabo:

xiv (660. 25), 139.

Suetonius:

Claud. (29), (39), 93; (45), 91.

Lucan. 87.

Nero (10), 86; (25), 90.

Vesp. (9), 84, 91.

Tacitus:

Ann. xii (3, 4), (6), 93; (8), 84; xiii (2), (5), 85; (25), 88; xiv (14, 15), 89; (16), 90; (52), 92; xvi (2), 91 f.

Themistius:

de Anima iv (107), 25.

Theocritus:

Id. xxiv (11-16), 104; (48), 109.

Varro:

L.L. v (65), 51; (112), 17.

Virgil:

Aen. iv (10), 33; vi (29), (335 f.), 33; vi (354), 33, 121; vii (76), (129); xi (453-4), 131.

Ecl. iii (26-7), 130.

Georg. i (107-11), 123; (108-9), 129; (133), (281-2), 123; (295), 132; (322-34), 126; (350), 123; (356-7), 128; (361), (369), (383), 123; (514), 132; ii (61), (153-4), (163-4), 123; iii (554), 129.

Xenophon:

Anab. I (ii. 1), (ii. 6), 67; II (vi. 28), 57.

PLATO'S EARLIER DIALECTIC

This volume is offered both as a contribution to the interpretation of Plato and to the history of logic. It depicts those ideas in Plato's early and middle dialogues which lie within the fields now called logic and methodology. These ideas directly and profoundly affected the formation of Aristotle's logic, and so the whole history of the subject.

By **RICHARD ROBINSON**
Associate Professor of Philosophy
in Cornell University 18/6 net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL

A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy

Edited by **L. P. JACKS**

October 1942 Contents

1. "THE DURATION OF THE WAR." A Bergsonian Study. L. P. Jacks
2. THE GOLDEN RULE VERSUS THE RIGHTS OF MAN. Edward W. Hirst
3. "KNOW THYSELF"—BUT HOW? Father F. C. Copleston, S.J.
4. AMERICAN PEACE PROGRAMMES. Professor Norman Bentwich
5. RELIGION IN A CONTROLLED SOCIETY. E. L. Allen, Ph.D.
6. THE CHURCH AS A VICTIM OF "CONTROL". J. W. B. Worsley, D.C.L.
7. RETRIBUTION AND REFORMATION. W. F. Lofthouse, D.D.
8. WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. Anne Holt, M.A.
9. THE CHRISTIAN FRONT IN EDUCATION. J. M. Lloyd Thomas
10. SIR FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.
11. PROPERTY—POSSESSION—USUFRUCT. Maude D. Petre
12. TIME IS NO HEALER. E. M. Rowell
13. THE CATHOLICISM OF RICHARD HOOKER. Father Maurice Bevenot, S.J.
14. SURVEY OF RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc.

SUBSCRIPTION: TEN SHILLINGS NET PER ANNUM, POST FREE

Apply for free specimen copy

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LIMITED

40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON WC1

THE ROMAN REVOLUTION

By **R. SYME** 21s. net

"The best book on Roman history that has appeared for many years."—*Spectator*.

"A most remarkable book. Brilliant alike in its marshalling of a vast mass of significant detail and in its uncompromising judgements on the general issues of the most complex period of Roman history, it provides a novel and striking treatment of a great theme."—*Greece and Rome*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

